

VOL.LXII,N0. 20 r7 TWICE A MONTH

% /

\$2.25 per copy 11d) \$40. ( )0 A YEAR

World Peace ' L J ;/ George Carey

. 1; 2"

THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF RELIGION 1 XXV /( Archbishop 011C'1nlcrbury \_ Page (111)  
n/1

1

The U. S. Navy VJ: 0/ 1 )1, Anthony Harrigan

GUARDIAN OF THE PAC1FTCTTNX MIX (/ selor 01 the U 5. Business 11nd Induslri' 11 Council  
Education Foundation & Page (114

/ Profit And Non- Profitx 1 N/WN L L C. Payne Lucas

A NEW AFRICAN BUSINESS PARTNERSHIP J / i D1 W

President 01 Africure \_- Page 617

William A. Zellmer

Vice President Protesion'11 21nd Public Atiairs

Alllelicull Society 01 Health System P11'1r111z1LisIs 7 P lge (119

SPEAK UP FOR THE PATIENT

Searching For The Soul Of PharmacyL (1/

Growth And The Road To Cyberspace Dana G. Mead

1

WE MbST TAKE RESPONSIBILITY Chairman and CEO. TenueLx and Chairman 01' NAM \_ Page (122

Women As Players Marilyn Carlson Nelson

THE TIME IS NOW Vice (11111111 The Carlson Company -- Page 626

Capital Punishment From A Global L 11V Jorge L, Carro

/

/

O

Perspectlve 1:)1'fsx'or 01,de Energixbniversity 01'C1111L'111111li & Page 629

THE DEATH PENALTY: RIGHT OR WRONG? bx 1X NJ

War Without End ' Lu Norm Bertasavage

THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A FORGOTTEN WAR , ViieVWZV lirmun P1'11 111g C011111115h/1n BI  
111L11 Township 7 P 1L 1: (112

0 M4

The Sale Of TWO Countries 19/ A L D. Scott McLain

A REVIEW OF SALES AND MARKETING PRINCIPLES L1: bu i0 R6211 1:51' 11L Bmkm A Page (135

Privatizing Social Security 1 Pete du Pont

1T CAN WORK: THE CHILE EXPERIENCE x i Former Governor 011 Delaware. Policy Chairman.

National Center for Policy Analysis - Page 637

Obstacles T0 The let Century Alan Sehriesheim

TeChnOlOgy Director & CEO, Argonne National Laboratory \_ Page 639

WILL WE RISE TO THE CHALLENGE?

IMPARTIAL o CONSTRUCTIVE 0 AUTHENTIC

THE BEST THOUGHT OF THE BEST MINDS ON CURRENT NATIONAL QUESTIONS

Vital Speeches Of the Day

R1-U 11X 1th1 M1

VOL. LXII. No. 20

AUGUST 1. 1996

NO. 20

World Peace

THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITY OF RELIGION

Address by GEORGE CAREY, Archbishop of Canterbury

Delivered to the Town Hall in Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, May 4. 1996

For God doth know how many now in health

Shall drop their blood in approbation

Of what your Reverence shall incite us to.

Therefore take heed how you impawn our person

How you awake our sleeping sword of war'

(Henry V. Act. I Scene 11).

Shakespeare's warning to the then Archbishop of Canterbury reveals some of the ambivalence concerning the relationship of religion to peace. In the play just quoted the Archbishop lends his moral authority to the rightness of war against the French. Henry's sober warning to take heed is one that has often been ignored through the centuries. Indeed, there are many who argue that religion has no grounds for claiming the high moral ground when it comes to peace. They assert that more cruelty, more wars, violence, bloodshed and evil have been perpetrated systematically in the name of religion than through any other disease of the human mind.

In this lecture I shall own up quite fairly to the responsibility religion must acknowledge in this regard. It is, however, also important to remind ourselves of the unspeakable cruelty and evil carried out by Communist and Nazi regimes which rejected religion. Human sinfulness can pollute every kind of belief system. Having said that, we can all agree at the very outset that religion has always had a moral responsibility to take heed how it awakens the sleeping sword of war. One of the remarkable aspects of humankind's religious quest is its resilience. Both Nazism and Communism are ideologically dead. Those forms of it which we see presently in the former Soviet Union seem to be the vehicle for various political and economic aspirations and discontents rather than an ideological commitment to the doctrines of Karl Marx and Lenin. What has not died is religion. Indeed it is awesomely present wherever we look in the world, not least those areas of the world where violence, terror and war continue to plague the human race. I think immediately of the Sudan, Israel and Palestine, Algeria and Libya, India. to say nothing of Northern Ireland and many parts of Africa. And if we consider our own communities, we find lurking there some of the ingredients for potential religious conflict, misunderstanding and intolerance. Three years ago Samuel P. Huntington, Eaton Professor of the Science of Government and Director of the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University raised a question which we still need to pursue. Some of his critics did not stop to notice that his essay was a question: The Clash of Civilisations. His thesis focused on the collapse of Communism and his observation that the new fault lines of conflict did not appear to be primarily economic or political but cultural and religious. The fault lines of civilisations will be the battle lines of the future he claimed.

But what did he mean by civilisations? and how does that relate to religions? A civilisation, according to Huntington is a cultural entity into which towns, cities and countries are subsumed. A civilisation is the highest cultural grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity possible. He goes on to say: Civilisations are differentiated from each other by history, culture, tradition and, most important, by religion. Prof. Huntington reaches the high point of his argument when the proposition is advanced that conflict between Islam and the

POLICY OF VITAL SPEECHES

The publishers of Vital Speeches believe that the important addresses of the recognized leaders of public opinion constitute the best expression of contemporary thought in America. and that it is extremely important for the welfare of the nation that these spee

ches be permanently recorded and disseminated The publishers have no axe to grind. Vital Speeches Will be found authentic and constructive.

It is the policy of the publishers to cover both sides of public questions and to print all speeches in full. Where it is necessary to condense a speech for reasons of unusual length

or the use of extraneous matter it will be so stated when printing. They feel that it is only in the unedited and unexpurgated speech that the reader can best obtain the view of the speaker

This material gives the reader the best thoughts of the best minds on current national problems. It also offers the student of public speaking examples of the effective speech of

today of those who have attained leadership in the fields of economics. politics. education. sociology. government, criminology finance, business. taxation. health. law. labor. etc.

Thus the student of public speaking obtains the finest text book material with sound knowledge of public questions.

Subscribers are urged to call the Editor's attention to any speeches which have impressed them as outstanding so that copies may be secured for review,

VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY is published twice a month by the CITY NEWS PUBLISHING CO. (Inc. 1911), 389 Johnnie Dodd BIVILL Suite C. Box 1247, Mount

Pleasant. S.C. 29465. Telephone 294-7311 Genevieve '12 Daly. President. Joyce Fox. Vice-President. Thomas F. Daly. III. Secretary-Treasurer and Managing Editors VITAL

SPEECHES (ISSN 0042-742X) Corporate Identification #13-0576754 Fax #803-294-4007. E-mail: vital@citynews.com

Subscription Rates: Beginning Sept, 1, 1994. the rates will be \$19.40 per year. Foreign one year: \$45.10 (including Canada and Mexico Single copies \$2.25 Back issues, if

available. within two years \$3.25 a copy. Microfilm and microfiche editions \$15.30 per Volume. subscribers only. On orders under \$22.50. remittance must accompany

order

Claims for non-delivery of issues must be made within two months of the date of the issue

Vital Speeches is Indexed in the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature. An annual index is printed each November and distributed to all subscribers. Cumulative Index.

Volumes 1-25. \$75.00 per copy. Volume Index. Volumes 26-51. \$50.00 per copy. plus postage Volume Binder for Vital Speeches \$15.00 plus postage. Vital Speeches will

be found on file in thousands of public, college and high school libraries throughout the United States.

Periodical rates paid at Mount Pleasant. SC. and additional mailing offices.

Printed in the USA

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to: 389 Johnnie Dodd Blvd. Box 1247. Mount Pleasant S.C. 29465.

GEORGE CAREY

West is probable. He quotes a well known Muslim author, M.J. Akbar who stated that the West's next confrontation is definitely going to come from the Muslim world. It is in the sweep of the Islamic nations from the Maghreb to Pakistan that the struggle for a new world order will come,

I will not trouble you with further exploration of that thesis except to say that it has been rigorously examined and, in my view, too quickly discounted in the West. For some it is too alarmist, too exaggerated and too readily exploits the ibogey view of Islam. For others its beguiling hypothesis is negated by the argument that the bloodiest conflicts in recent years have been within civilisations rather than between them. For others Huntington's argument is simply too politically incorrect and insensitive to merit serious discussion.

For the purposes of this lecture I wish to hold on to one element of Huntington's thesis which I believe to be essential for world peace. It is his conclusion that the West is required to develop a more profound understanding of the basic religious and philosophical assumptions underlying other civilisations and the ways in which people in those civilisations see their interests.

It is good to report that religion is now being taken seriously not merely as a problem, but also as part of the answer. For example the recent book Religion: the Missing Dimension of Statecraft, from the Center for Strategic and International Studies, witnesses to an awareness of the crucial role that faith communities and particularly their leaders play in resolving conflict.

What are some of the reasons for this change of heart? Part of it lies in the repositioning of religion in relation to culture, values and community. The globalisation of western values has been both welcomed and feared. Few people deny the contribution that Western science and technology has made to the world community. Wherever people are they clamour for material prosperity and all the benefits that go with it.

However, this undoubted gift to humankind seems to go hand in hand with a secularism which seems destructive of culture and traditional values. Kishore Mabbubani, Dean of the Civil Service College, Singapore, in his response to Samuel Huntington's argument, is ready to affirm the importance of the West as the repository of some of the greatest assets and achievements of human civilisation. He accepts that many western values explain the spectacular advance of mankind. But he questions the hubris which has accompanied it. He wonders what kind of civilisation it is which is content with material prosperity and which seems to be so casual about massive social decay represented by violent crime, permissive sexual ethics, the breakup of family and community life and a widening gulf between rich and poor.

In our cultures, too, whatever the state of church attendance, there is a searching for spiritual values in which the faith traditions are invited eagerly to make their contribution. Harvey Cox's recent book Fire From Heaven, a study of Pentecostalism, is a candid admission that the death of God theologians of the 60s got it all wrong. Cox admits that the demise of institutional mainstream Christianity which he and other theologians prophesied in the 60s had not happened, rather the reverse, religion even in its institutional forms is on the increase and shows no sign of abating.

Unfortunately, the story which makes the news is bad religion. Almost every week we are subjected to scenes of horror on our TV screens when unspeakable atrocities against innocent

people are done in the name of religion. There can be no justification from within any of our religious traditions for such intolerance and fanaticism. The question therefore facing all faith communities is: Have they the capacity to transcend the willful, negative and destructive features of religion and culture which have done so much damage to our world? Can they use the undoubted strength of religion to bring about a new world

order of peace?

For the picture is far from uniform. There is certainly a great deal of good religion about. The unsung and often unpublicised good deeds of faith communities is a heart-warming story of faith in action. We are not good at telling this story.

Moreover, many people will share the view that the greatest challenges facing world order and peace will not be met without the motivating power of faith. How else can momentum be found for combatting the worst excesses of poverty and inequality around the world? How else can we find the self-restraint in the interest of future generations in order to save the environment? How else can we combat the malignant power of exclusive nationalism and racism? All this requires the dynamic power of commitment, faith and love. The privatised morality of what works for me will not do.

Let us recall some of the fundamentals of Christianity which go to the very heart of reconciliation. It is posited on a purpose and power beyond ourselves: the tyranny of me and my perspective, is broken. Christianity insists on justice. because we have a common Creator who loves every person equally. It teaches that we are all fallible and in need of God's grace, and this should undermine the pride which makes it difficult to compromise or say sorry. Our God of forgiveness encourages us to forgive those who sin against us. Those are indeed the essential elements of reconciliation and underpin so many church initiatives in pursuit of justice and peace in world conflicts. Within that framework, what of the distinctive role of Anglicanism?

The sub-title of this lecture includes the phrase The contribution of the Anglican Communion

This may seem to be an arrogation of power and authority out of keeping with our size.

Compared with the Roman Catholic Church we are a small Communion of some 70 million or so active members. So a proper degree of humility is in order. We do not have the resources that other greater Communion or fellowships of Churches have. But there are several features in our history, theology and development that are worth noting and sharing with other faith communities, as a contribution to our common calling to be peacemakers.

First we can share our history. Years ago when I was a young Curate in a London Church and leading several boys' clubs, one boy sent me an unusual birthday card. It showed a man looking into a mirror. The caption read: 'You are not entirely useless. You can always serve as a bad example.' We all have skeletons in our cupboards and this is certainly true of the history of religions. Anglicanism grew out of the bitter conflicts of the Reformation period. The Church of England became a national Church like so many others on mainland Europe. As Church and nation were seen as one other, religious expressions were banned. Roman Catholicism was suppressed because it was seen as the religion of foreign powers. But other Christian expressions of faith were suppressed too – the Puritans, Anabaptists and all those whose forms of wor-

ship lay outside the Prayer Book. Later when the Puritans came to power the Church of England was on the receiving end and Anglican worship was silenced for a few years and all Anglican clergy were deprived. So yes. we can serve as a bad example.

Yet. there were also prophets, people who pointed to the depths of faith in order to denounce intolerance. John Locke, one of the most famous philosophers and thinkers of the 17th Century, who was pleased to call himself a Church of England man. wrote to a critic: Since you are pleased to enquire what are my thoughts about the mutual Toleration of Christians in their different professions of religion. I must needs answer you freely. that I esteem toleration to be the chief characteristic mark of the True Church

And alongside the conflicts were such formative examples of reconciliation as the way in which Queen Elizabeth and her advisors dealt with the question of the Eucharist. The issue of transubstantiation. you will recall, was one for which Protestants and Catholics killed and burned each other for years. Deep divisions remained about what exactly happened to the bread and wine. Elizabeth's solution, in a nutshell, was to find a form of words and an attitude which enabled people with different views on this question to remain in the same Church and join together in worship for the sake of all they have in common. Specific doctrinal divisions were held to be less important than the common core of belief and were to be contained rather than allowed to torment schism. This is at the heart of the Anglican tradition.

Second. we can share our theology. Through that painful period of our history which featured the first attempts by Puritans and others to seek freedom and tolerance in the New World, the Church of England was seeking to discover something that was already there in our liturgy and articles - namely, the striving after inclusivism. Whatever the Reformation represents today, in the days of the first English Reformers, the Church as Catholicism was not questioned. Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker and others simply did not see themselves as revolutionaries - they were reformers. They were not founding a new Church - it was the same Church as before but now renewed through a return to what was essentially Catholic rather than medieval teaching and rites. Cranmer put it so well in his introduction to the Prayer Book: And, whereas in our time the minds of men are so diverse that some think it a matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their ceremonies. And on the other side some be so new tangled that they would innovate all things and so despise the old it was thought expedient. not so much to have respect how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as how to please God. and profit them both What Cranmer fought for in worship was sought in matters of doctrine and life. As we have seen the Anglican tradition has often sought compromise. not just because of old fashioned English pragmatism, but because we have perceived that there is something deeply Christian about comprehensiveness. We do not believe that any Church possesses the entire Christian truth and that no single tradition can claim to be the sole repository of divine revelation. Thus. within our body we have sought to hold the diverse strands of Church life, whether it has been evangelical, catholic. liberal or Charismatic. We have noted that honourable people have inhabited these traditions and that truth is to be found in them all - but we have not accepted that any one of them has the right to arrogate to itself complete authority thus de-churching the rest.

#### VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

Our recent decision to ordain women to the Priesthood is an example of the comprehensiveness we have struggled to express. By an overwhelming vote General Synod decided to accept women for the Ordained Ministry. This conclusion to twenty years. hard thought and work saddened a significant minority. We could have decided as a Church to ignore them - alter all, Synod had made the decision with acclaim. We did

not ignore them. We provided alternative pastoral care and made reasonable financial provision available to those who in conscience could not stay in the Church. We were criticised for this generosity. Our talk of two integrities, was called theological nonsense. Our pastoral arrangements through three so-called 'lying bishops' were criticised as undermining the unity of the Church. Our financial arrangements were criticised as being unnecessary. But a mere two years later the apparent messiness of these arrangements have brought a calmness to the Church which has allowed the two integrities on this particular issue to live together in peace for the sake of all we have in common.

This kind of Anglican comprehensiveness carries implicitly, within its being, structured dissent. We are a Communion which has internalised disagreement and lives with it gladly, most of the time. If you like, we are content to live with blurred edges and with some degree of provisionality. This is not to be confused with vagueness, or woolly-mindedness or lack of theological integrity. I have heard it said that the genius of Anglicanism is 'that it doesn't matter what you believe as long as you don't take it too seriously'. That is nonsense, in the sense that we hold passionately to the core of the faith and are deeply committed to God and his world and to every neighbour. But there is such a thing as Anglican thought, polity and lifestyle. We are committed to discovering God's truth and making it known. But we are equally ready to live with questions and to resist easy answers if there are in fact none to hand.

Third, we can share an experience. I have said that we are a small Communion. However, we are also an international Communion which, now residing in over 150 countries, lost its Englishness years ago. The Lambeth Conference which brings bishops from our 36 Provinces every ten years, now numbers over 800. We work among the very poor of the world and we suffer with them. Our Church has its share of martyrs and we number among our body those who have distinguished themselves in human fights and social justice. I think of Desmond Tutu whose distinguished ministry in South Africa was rewarded with the Nobel Prize. But I think also of Bishop Dinis Singulane, whose contribution towards peace in Mozambique was heroic, self-sacrificial and noteworthy. Many other stories can be told of the experience of living an open faith. Central to this experience is our theology which emphasises the Incarnation of our Lord.

Christianity has to be lived out where people suffer and die. It stresses that faith without works lacks true substance and works without faith is but social action. Anglicans have traditionally had a substantial stake in education in many countries around the world and its multitudes of schools and colleges can be seedbeds of peace-loving values.

Furthermore we believe in bringing home to people God's protest against anything that dehumanises his world and harms those made in his image and likeness. Anglicanism can be modestly proud of its enormous investment in hospitals, Clinics, schools and homes among the world's poor. My visit to Rwanda last year made me aware of the rich contribution that

GEORGE CAREY

our Church made to that country over the years and how desperately Rwanda needs it now in the task of rebuilding that is going on.

Moreover, many Anglican Churches have quite strong national structures as well as a wider international dimension as Provinces within a worldwide communion. This can be a relevant combination in exercising influence in resolving conflicts, for a variety of historical reasons. Anglicans tend to be disproportionately represented among influential elites in many countries, bringing special responsibilities and opportunities. And, within the world of religion, we find ourselves, from our very nature, as a bridge between Protestant and Catholic traditions. Where Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches may at times experience some friction or political tension, Anglicans can sometimes act as interpreters and bridge builders. And these habits of bridge-building can then be applied in other dimensions of life.

Therefore, putting the story, the theology and the experience together; what is the message that comes from within the heart of Anglicanism as we feel the longing in the human family for peace? Let me suggest four principles.

i. Making room for others is essential. Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948 declares: 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This includes the freedom to change his religion or belief.' I have called this in several addresses the commitment to reciprocity. And we must not be halfhearted about it. Muslims, Hindus, Sikhs and others have equal rights to worship freely in the West and to make disciples just as Christians do. However, this must apply equally to the rights that Christians should have in places where they are in a minority.

ii. Making tolerance central to our beliefs. Tolerance appears to be in short supply these days. But believers who deny it to others are denying something central to their religious tradition. In all mainstream faiths tolerance and acceptance of differences are written into our codes. Sadly, the injunctions to respect, honour and tolerate those of other faiths are not always heeded. And yet terrible things continue to be done in the name of religion which shames religion and makes it a disgrace.

Therefore we need to ask \_ Is it not time to espouse a genuine toleration which goes beyond mere acceptance of one another? True tolerance has something to do with intensity of commitment towards another. Indifference is often confused with tolerance. Baroness Wootton once observed sarcastically: 'People are only tolerant about things they don't really care about.' But genuine tolerance goes beyond indifference; it travels further than mere co-existence. It ends in risky identification with those whose faiths and lifestyles are different and with a commitment to living and working with them. We need to point to good examples which may provide encouragement and hope in a world damaged by indifference and intolerance alike.

iii. Making room for common action and protest. If religions are not dying out and may be on the increase in many parts of our world, then religious leadership has a responsibility to resist anything that is done in the name of religion which denies the true ends of religion. I think of extremism which ends in murder and violence. Sometimes when acts are perpetrated by fundamentalists occur I am saddened by the fact that few leaders in such faith communities condemn the atrocities. There can be no justifications for acts that leave innocent people dead and wounded. People should not hide behind religious

613

faith to justify acts of terrorism. Prof. Jean Kirkpatrick quotes a deeply religious Muslim who remarked: 'Please do not call them Muslim fundamentalists. They do not represent a more fundamental version of Islam. They are simply Muslims who are also violent political extremists.' Such extremists, wherever they are found \_ in Egypt, Israel, Northern Ireland or elsewhere a must not find a refuge in religious faith. We must make it clear



that true religion does not justify such behaviour. They must be condemned.

And it is best when we can join in common action against racism, against violence and intolerance together. We must learn to listen to minorities in our communities and seek to give them a voice in raising their concerns. Again, Anglicans have an experience to share here because in so many parts of the world we know what it is like to be a minority. Indeed, small can be beautiful and may be an effective tool for the love of God, especially where that small church may hold the ring between greater forces than itself. I think of the witness of the Anglican Church in mainland Europe where its congregations, though numerous, can never be seen as serious threats to larger religious communities. As such they are often seen as communities of trust and sometimes as arbiters where disputes scar dialogue.

iv. Holding the tension between the particular and the universal. We need never be apologetic about the universal claims and integrity of Christian faith. Dialogue and friendship with other faiths does not mean that we sell our soul to a lowest common denominator of faith or to mushy religious-sounding vagueness. I do not believe that all religions are the same and I certainly do not believe that Jesus Christ is merely one great religious figure among others.

Nevertheless, missionary faiths like Christianity and Islam have a duty to look carefully at the tension between making disciples, on the one hand, and respect for other faiths on the other. I believe the task can be done on the basis that faith claims are essentially invitations \_ invitations to consider that what our experience has meant to us may be something that may transform someone else. That implies that I, too, am obliged to listen to someone else's journey of faith and study the challenge that it brings to me.

In spite of the unique claims of faith communities which must be respected as aspects of religious integrity, we must also note the impressive common ground we all share. Perhaps even here, Anglican experience of inclusivism and tolerating different points of view has something to offer. On the eve of a new millennium we desperately need to concentrate on what unites us. We owe it to our children and their children to build a more just and peaceful world, a world of tolerance in which love and harmony may flourish. This means we need to go deeper into the traditions of our faith and be prepared to study other faiths more positively than we have previously done. As we do so, we shall note that all the great human values that mean so much to us are belief in a purpose beyond ourselves. tolerance, justice, human dignity, love of others, respect for the elderly, the young and the vulnerable \_ are in fact universal religious values. The sacred texts of all religions represent the striving of the human heart for peace. They argue for solidarity and harmony among all people. love thy neighbour as thyself is central to Jesus's summary of the Law. The same sentiment is to be found in all faiths.

v. There is one final thing that may be shared by us all. It is to join in common witness to the spiritual longings in all hu-

man beings. The highest desires of true civilisation are to be found in religious hope and expression. 11) as someone once said that the supreme expression of culture is behaviour then the sublime ethics of religion at their very best pose an important challenge to anything that diminishes the human spirit. We know that in so many affluent countries a deep moral uncertainty inhibits the embrace of strong moral principles as a guide for generations to come. Young people are growing up with deep spiritual longings that need to be directed into unselfish ends but they are given little direction. it shop. therefore I am has replaced Descartes \_ tl think. therefore I amf Spiritual communities have resources to Challenge the consumerism which lies at the heart of materialistic societies. We can only make an effective contribution to that task if we put our houses in order. I do not claim that the Communion I represent has all the answers. I can only promise that we intend to go on making our own contribution from within our history. experience and thought. in common witness with other Christian denominations. and in dialogue with people of other faiths and none.

Mr. Chairman, 3 friend of mine in England is a black Christian. VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

He is concerned about those black communities in Britain which have so much to offer but are hardly given a voice. He told me recently about a little black boy in Britain who was totally withdrawn. He never spoke to anyone at school. Every one became very worried and a counsellor was called in. She said tenderly to him: Do your parents talk to you? t iNO., iDO your brothers and sisters talk to you? lNof lDO your friends talk to you? No? tDoes your best friend Mervyn talk to you? th, yesi came the reply. And what does he say to your asked the Counsellor. He tells me to shut upf

Like that little boy. religious communities demand to be listened to. We are here in great strength and have much to offer. Yes. there is much bad religion around. The public rhetoric of religion is often bereft of the gentleness and grace that is there in true spirituality. We must all pledge our determination to make a creative contribution to the world as the new millenium approaches. Whether it be a millennium of peace or war will depend to a large measure on the ability of the great religions, and Christianity in particular. to draw from within themselves all which makes for peace \_ the peace which the God of Love wants for all his Children.

The U.S. Navy

GUARDIAN OF THE PACIFIC

Address by ANTHONY HARRIGAN. Counselor offlze US. Business and Industrial Council Edut'at iona/ Foundation

Delivered at the University ()an/nrado, Denver, Colorado. June 12. 1996

n a recent essay on the Pacific in Americas overall strategic posture, James A. Kelly, president of the Pacific Forum in Honolulu and a former Assistant Secretary of Defense for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, noted that ttAmerican Pacific military strategy is essentially naval in character. and has been dictated largely by time and distance across the Pacific." This is as true today as it was in World War II or the Spanish-American War. Naval power is the only effective means for showing the flag and projecting power across vast ocean distances and onto the islands of the Pacific and the Asian mainland itself. This was demonstrated again in the crisis over Taiwan in March. at which time two carrier battle groups were sent into the waters off Taiwan, a highly visible American presence incorporating tremendous power. It would have been of no use to send B-2 bombers over the Taiwan Strait. They would have been invisible or visible for only a few minutes. And visibility is very important in such crisis situations.

Unfortunately. this is not well understood in the highest places. In many influential Circles there is the notion that crisis situations around the globe can be solved by an airlift of American troops. Instead, President Clinton gave explicit confirmation ofthis view at Long Beach, California, February 23. Citing

the capabilities of a new military transport plane. the C-17. Certainly, the United States needs modernized and augmented airlift capability. But airlift is not a substitute for forward deployment of ground forces, especially in the vast Pacific region and when our most likely adversary ; China has an army of immense size. Over dependence on airlift or weapons such as the B-2 is part of the Fortress America mentality. And remember, in the Gulf War. the United States and its allies took six months to build up the ground forces necessary to defeat a puny military force. the Iraqi army.

This is the reason why. in Mr. Kelly's words. the United States has maintained a semi-permanent Asia-Pacific forward force structure at about the level of about 100,000." When one considers the vastness of the region and the scope of the security threat. a commitment of this size seems very modest. And given the stake for the United States. I would submit that Americans must be prepared to support a much larger commitment of forces.

The security stake is still poorly perceived by the American public. though that may change over the next few years. The Chinese war games aimed at the intimidation of Taiwan and challenging the United States may already have raised the consciousness of the American people with regard to the security stake. Jim Hoagland. editorial columnist for The Washington Post. anything but a hardline conservative or defense hawk. described that stake in a column in the Post in March. He said that the Clinton administration "must now think the unthinkable namely that China may go to war to achieve its political ends. He dismissed the assertions of most commentators that the Chinese are only playing psychological games. asserting that "miscalculation and hubris can sweep away those rational scenarios. in the blink of any eye." He argued that China is dead serious in its long-term confrontation with the West. adding that warning of an escalation of China's aggressive behavior and calling on the President to pledge "unambiguous U.S. military support for Taiwan."

Such comments underline the central truth of the strategic situation in the Pacific. namely that the United States must be prepared to fight and win a war if one breaks out. not simply show the flag and display its military capabilities.

ANTHONY HARRIGAN

If this is the case, the Challenge to the United States is of epochal dimensions. And the American people will have to start thinking about the possibility: they better start thinking about it. If Chinals bellicose posture develops into a real war \_ threatening position, we don't begin our military response to such a challenge in a particularly strong position. As I have said, the character of the Pacific world makes it necessary that our first line of defense be of a naval character. But our Navy has been partially dismantled over the past three years. President Reagan sought the construction of a 600-ship Navy to maintain our supremacy on the world's oceans, and the Navy actually reached a level of 575 ships. Today, it has 370 ships, and more reductions are planned for the years ahead.

Only a few years ago, the U.S. Navy had 16 aircraft carriers. Today, we have 12, with one of those ships scheduled for decommissioning in the near future, our naval force level for the vast Western Pacific is very low, with only about 50 to 60 ships of all types on station across thousands of miles.

Former Secretary of the Navy, James H. Webb, a Marine officer in Vietnam and Navy Cross winner, made this point in a speech before the U.S. Naval Institute at Annapolis in late April. He said:

Whenever a crisis erupts that threatens our country's security interests, most of us know the first question usually asked by the president's national security advisers: Where are the carriers? And the answer is always the same: They are either on station or proceeding with all due speed into harm's way. I was in Asia during the tensions that flared just before the Taiwanese elections. Whether the administration used them properly or not, the carriers were there, ready to strike, just as they have been in or near every other hot spot over the last 50 years.

To be specific, the officers and sailors were there, showing once again why the carrier battle group is the most potent and formidable tactical assemblage in history. As always, the finest combat pilots in the world were in their ready rooms or on the catapults, prepared to do whatever it took to defend the security interests of the United States. They have never failed our nation, not once.

We have a navy that is undermanned and undermaintained. Warships of great combat potential in a war situation have been retired from the fleet. While the Russians \_ even in their weakened economic condition continue to build submarines, U.S. submarine construction has been virtually halted, with arguments raging over whether we need one or two more submarines. Naval facilities have been closed all along the West Coast. The United States has given up its great naval base at Subic Bay in the Philippines. After a horrendous crime committed on Okinawa, we are losing Marine bases on the island. In short, we are stretched very thin everywhere on the high seas. And a thin naval presence in the Pacific is especially dangerous because of the vast area involved and the rapid growth of the Chinese armed forces.

While American armed forces are contracting, China's military budgets are increasing at least about 20 percent a year, possibly much more than that. It is purchasing the most advanced military hardware, including the T-800 gas turbine tank and a Patriot-type anti-missile system. The Far Eastern Economic Review revealed last summer that more than 1,000 former Soviet military scientists are working for China. Its nuclear tests continue. Former U.S. ambassador James Lilley has said that this Chinese arms build-up has its sights set beyond China's borders.

615

Despite this build-up, the U.S. government \_ the Clinton administration \_ continues to adhere to a policy it describes as engagement. This is a dangerous illusion, as evidenced most recently by the Taiwan crisis in March. However, the policy carries over from the Bush administration. It is this policy that has led to the military technology transfers to China. Fundamental to the mistaken policy is the notion that, with closer

economic ties. China will learn to play by the rules of international behavior. As a policy, it is mistaken as the detente policy the Nixon administration adopted towards Soviet Russia. Under detente the Soviets drove as hard as possible for military supremacy.

The reality is that China is committed to building a strong navy that will give it power in the maritime realm that it has on the Asian mainland. I believe that in the century ahead China will not only insist on control of all the subsidiary seas of the Pacific but will extend its reach to the Indian Ocean, an Ocean where Chinese ships of war ranged widely in past centuries. attacking Ceylon and sending fleets down the coast of Africa. The U.S. policy towards China, I submit, must be one of containment, and that will require a much larger commitment of naval forces to the Pacific.

Those who are opposed to a policy of containment may charge that it is purely negative and doesn't contain any of the promises of a policy of engagement — the hope for a China that behaves in a more normal civilized way. This charge was made against the policy of containment with respect to Soviet Russia.

Not surprisingly, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, now an international business consultant, strenuously opposes a policy of containment. Flying in the face of contemporary evidence, he asserted (The Washington Post, March 30) that China has an interest in the peaceful evolution of Asia? He further argued that if hostility to China were to become our foreign policy, we would find no allies?

This, I believe, is utterly without foundation. Bear in mind that many elements in Europe opposed our containment policy with respect to the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, they went along with the U.S. And time proved that they were wrong in opposing containment.

In addition, one has to say that there are reasons to believe that Henry Kissinger's accommodationist position is hostage to his business interests.

Dr. Kissinger is not alone in his accommodationist stance. The Economist magazine noted April 13th that "with the impending reintegration of Hong Kong into China. Western financiers and businessmen are keener than ever to see their investments in the area safeguarded?

In connection with Dr. Kissinger's position. it is interesting to note the editorial position of the London Financial Times which commented March 19 that "If the U.S. security role in Asia is to be credible, Washington must now show that it is capable of acting as policeman. Other Asian nations must lend explicit moral support in doing so, so that China sees that there are limits to its anti-social behavior."

Containment worked with respect to the USSR. The strong U.S. and allied policy contributed significantly to the breakdown of the Soviet order. In the long run, the only hope with respect to China is that communist rule will collapse. I argue that it is never sound policy to appease and/or feed a totalitarian regime. In any case. American values make close ties with a totalitarian China an impossibility. For many Americans. it

is an outrage that our government gives Most Favored Nation trade status to a regime that has a vast Chinese-style gulag system slave labor camps.

Ofcourse. containing Chinal's ambitions and aggressiveness will not come at low cost. Every year, the Chinese are raising the stakes as they augment their military forces. Some attention has been devoted to Chinal's acquisition of Russian SU-27 multi-mission fighters. Little, very little attention has been devoted to the upgrading of the Chinese Navy. Naval sources report that China is initially aiming at a force of 40 quiet Russian diesel-electric submarines \_ a formidable threat to U.S. naval forces in the Pacific.

The Chinese fleet is acquiring capable Luh-class destroyers and Jiangwei-class frigates. It is widely agreed by defense analysts that the Chinese expect to acquire two 45,000-ton aircraft carriers by 2005. Seapower magazine states that the Chinese armed forces want an aircraft carrier badly, and by early in the next decade a visible sea-based aviation project will be under way."

Behind the build-up is high quality naval leadership. This is described in the Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute article (April 1996) "China's Mahan" by Lt. Cdr. Jeffrey Goldman, USNR. The article describes the career, leadership, and strategic ideas of Adm. Liu Jieying who directed his service away from coastal defense to the goal of a blue water navy. He now holds the very powerful position of Vice Chairman of the Central Military Commission, the top military body in China. Lt. Cdr. Goldman states the Chinese admiral "foresaw the need for an offshore defense strategy that would encompass operations as far as the second island chain the Bonins, the Marianas, Guam, and the Carolines? In their history of China's nuclear navy, John Lewis and Xue Litai described the shift in doctrinal emphasis:

"Since the late 1980s navy planners have called for changing from a coastal defense strategy to an offshore defense strategy. They would extend the defense perimeter to between 200 nm and 400 nm from the coast, and even more in the case of the South China Sea islands. The navy hopes to have a so-called offshore navy on patrol by the year 2000 and a bluewater navy operating by 2050."

In view of the augmentation of Chinese naval forces and their plans for the future, it should be clear that there will be heavy demands on the sea services in the years ahead. Indeed the demand for U.S. naval forces from the Taiwan Strait to the Adriatic Sea - in support of operations in and over Bosnia \_ underlines the fact that the U.S. Navy already is too small to meet the demands created by an unstable and dangerous world full of ambitious aggressive forces. The variety of naval threats and problems runs across the spectrum. Earlier this year, our two NATO partners, Greece and Turkey, almost started a naval war over a tiny island in the Aegean Sea.

The presence of a powerful Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean was an effective deterrent to an insanely foolish war. Even when ground forces are withdrawn from Bosnia, need will exist for a U.S. aircraft carrier in the Adriatic to help prevent the breakout of another Bosnian war. The dangers in the Persian Gulf and Arabian Sea are growing as Iran acquires submarines and new missiles. Then there is Iraq, which has never been fully disarmed and continues as a live threat. Compound that with the danger posed by Pakistan which is obtaining missiles and, most probably, nuclear weapons parts from China. It is the existence of dangers such as these. that caused the United STATES TO CREATE THE 5TH FLEET IN 1995, a fleet with headquarters at Bahrain in the Persian Gulf. But where will the ships come from to carry out assigned missions over the vast Indian Ocean and subsidiary seas and gulfs, even as requirements are expanded elsewhere around the world?

Incidentally, during the Taiwan crisis in March, the Navy had to detach the carrier Nimitz and its battle group from the

had to detach the carrier Nimitz and its battle group from the

Indian Ocean to bolster the American presence near Taiwan.

This makes clear that the U.S. hasn't enough ships to cover all the strategic bases. One should ask: What if the U.S. had a crisis involving Iran or Iraq at the time it had a crisis in the South China Sea or in Korean waters?

Even as the Navy is shrinking in size, subject to shrunken ship construction budgets, the country is necessarily returning to a maritime policy. Maj. Gen. James L. Jones, the director of Expeditionary Warfare for the Navy Department, has noted that this is happening after 50 years being locked into a continental policy, on a continent that wasn't even ours, presumably meaning Europe. Whatever the wisdom of the U.S. intervention in Somalia \_ and it seems clear that the intervention was a mistake because of American misunderstanding of the internal forces in Somalia, the only instrument available to the United States was the use of sea power to make possible the landings. If sea power had been used more intelligently, the failure of the mission might not have taken place. If power projection is needed elsewhere in Africa in the years ahead, in Libya, a rogue state, for example, the United States would have to respond with the sea-based air power, as it has done in the past.

To perform these and other missions \_ from the Pacific to the Persian Gulf requires the requisite number of carrier battle groups, carriers and associated warships with anti-missile and anti-submarine capabilities, also air groups of the highest quality. No one doubts the quality of American airmen in any of the services, but the quality of the planes available is a matter of concern, or should be. Unfortunately, the U.S. Navy is operating with many aircraft that came into service long ago \_ two decades ago. This is part of the price of underfunding procurement in the Navy, as well as the other services. Ironically, other nations are buying aircraft that are more modern than many of those that fly off our carriers.

While other countries are buying advanced U.S. fighters off the shelf, our services have to do with over age planes. This was illustrated with dramatic and tragic clarity when Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and 34 others lost their lives in a 23-year old Air Force transport that had not been updated with modern navigational aids \_ aids which most probably would have prevented a crash. This was the same plane that Mrs. Clinton had used to fly into the Bosnian war zone. Why is it that the Air Force had such a plane in its inventory and used to fly VIPs around Europe? The answer is because the Air Force lacks funds to modernize its fleet, precisely as the Navy lacks funds for its fighters and other aircraft needed in combat. It is often said that the United States would never provide its fighting forces with less than the best, but that isn't true.

Underfunding of military procurement exposes American personnel to unnecessary risks.

This reality raises ominous questions about the ability of the United States to deal with the threat posed by China in the Western Pacific and its subsidiary seas.

The initial need is to spend \$3 billion. The Wall Street Journal estimate, to turn some 40 Aegis-class destroyers into a sea based anti-missile system. Sen. Robert Dole wants such a sys-

C. PAYNE LUCAS

tem in place by 2003 and has introduced the Defend America Act to ensure its existence. The proposed Navy system would destroy enemy missiles in outer space or as they rise off launching pads.

As of last year, only 11 Aegis equipped destroyers had been commissioned. Meanwhile, under Clinton administration policies, there has been what Seapower calls "wholesale decommissioning" of modern, well-armed cruisers, leaving only four nuclear-powered cruisers in the fleet — a tragic loss for the Navy in the Pacific Ocean with its vast distances and resulting problems with refueling.

The U. S. Navy's Upper Tier theater missile defense program would have the capability of attacking incoming missiles warheads at an altitude of sixty miles.

But there has been administration resistance to full, robust testing of the Navy's Upper Tier anti-missile system. That system is needed now as the Chinese missile threat is a real and present threat.

The cost and delays associated with the Upper Tier system make a search for an alternative for the short run a significant imperative. And the April 1996 number of Proceedings of the US. Naval Institute contains a proposal for such an alternative.  
617

An article in that journal asserts that the surviving battleship built would be an "exceptionally" anti-ballistic missile platform. The author envisions using rocket-assisted projectiles in the battleships' 16-inch cannon, giving the battleships strategic capabilities at bargain basement cost. He says that the shells would have a range of thousands of miles and be capable of hitting ballistic missiles aimed at the United States. Certainly, this is a proposal that should receive the closest scrutiny in the Executive and Legislative branches of our government.

One can only hope that the government and people of the United States will appreciate anew the fact that we are an island nation and that our security and well-being in future depend on a maritime vision and that we can't afford oceanic ignorance or a diminishment of the fleet, that makes possible the Navy's role as our Guardian of the Pacific frontier. Sea power has been crucial in world history since the Greeks defeated the Persians at the Battle of Salamis in classical times. Whoever controls the oceans controls the world. If Americans understand then they will understand the necessity of an appropriate naval build-up, that will prevent China from dominating the Pacific in the next century.

Profit And Non-Profit

A NEW AFRICAN BUSINESS PARTNERSHIP

Address by C. PAYNE LUCAS, President of Africa's

Delivered to the Business Advisory Council Of the International Finance Corporation, Washington, DC, May 20, 1996

business people. I say "fellow business people" because running an NGO is like running a business. I have to make a payroll every two weeks. I have a board of directors scrutinizing our balance sheet. I have to make risky investments. I know that there is no sure thing. The only real difference between you and me is that you can get your banker to cover a bad year. A non-profit can't afford to have a bad year.

Africa, as I am sure you are aware, seems to have nothing BUT bad years. They started with the slave trade, which accounted for about 250 bad years. Colonial rule was at best a mixed blessing during its century or so. The years of white minority rule in Southern Africa were clearly a losing proposition. A plague of post-colonial conflicts has added to Africa's development deficit.

I could spend my allotted time this evening trying to explain Africa's predicament. It would be a chance to get a lot off my chest. Africa has been my life for the past 35 years, and I still get a thrill when I recall the hope and promise that permeated the Africa that I first met in 1961. But I am sure you do not want to hear me apologize for Africa, or to vent my disap-



pointments.

I am here this evening because I still believe that Africa has an important role to play as part of the international community; that the world needs an economically viable Africa. an environmentally sound Africa, a peaceful, stable and growing Africa. I am also here because I believe that you and we \_ business and the so-called NGOs \_ have more in common than we might realize.

Africa is just beginning to cultivate what we frequently call It is a pleasure to be with you this evening, among fellow a llcivil societyll\_which is nothing more than the web of institutions, associations and other connections which enable a People to identify with one another, and to share resources in pursuit of a common destiny.

Africa is shedding its cumbersome and scaly governmental skin. It is learning that governments do not exist to monopolize the national wealth. They exist to create a framework that encourages people \_ and the private sector \_ to generate wealth, and through that wealth. promote greater well-being for the people at large.

This shedding of skin is a fitful and uneven process. It is grudging on the part of politicians and soldiers who have grown accustomed to sharing the spoils of power\_ a power that gradually is being diluted by the inevitable rise of the three llza-tionsll: democratization, privatization and decentralization.

That is why I am confident that the Africa we will know a generation from now, well into the 21st century, will be a considerably different and better place. Do not look for miracles in the short-term. Renaissance is a long-term proposition. Look instead for a slow but steady defusing of ethnic conflict and political instability. Look for fewer refugees and less rapid population growth. Look for more effective conservation of natural resources. Look for acceptable levels of economic growth fueled by development of a broader middle class, by a more entrepreneurial spirit and by relatively Cheap solar energy and hydropower, among other factors.

I cannot promise what may seem too optimistic a scenario. However, I can Cite encouraging indicators of Change. First is the sobering realization, throughout Africa, that there is a fundamental Choice to be made at community, national and re-

gional levels: Do we follow the self-destructive path of Somalia, Rwanda and Liberia? Enough Africans read the newspapers and watch CNN to know. second hand. the horrors of communal violence and national wars. Many more know it first-hand. Most. I would argue. have seen enough.

A second promising indicator is the rise of a better educated and more pragmatic leadership. These are people who are less captivated by ideology than those who came of political age in the struggle against Western colonial rule. The first generation of African leaders indulged in socialist experiments. which helped to blunt economic growth and retard development of a genuine private sector. Today's leaders are increasingly interested in making things work. in part because they are increasingly accountable to a voting public.

A third factor might surprise you: women. African women, to be more precise. My colleagues and I at AfriForum have come to the conclusion. based on long experience, that a development program which does not substantially involve women is almost bound to fail.

African women are becoming more engaged in development. in business. in civil society and in governance. They are excellent business people. incidentally. and very good at taking care of money. I believe women will have a qualitative impact on the pace and direction of change in Africa. in part because they seem to have a greater appreciation for the bottom line.

This is just one of the lessons we and others have learned in Africa. over many years and sometimes in defiance of common sense. Donors and development banks alike have encouraged Africans to invest in quick economic fixes. in untried schemes and theories. We all wanted to see results in a reasonably short period of time. We relied for a long time on working primarily with governments. We talked a lot about involving the people \_ the beneficiaries \_ but that was frequently lip service. Why ask questions when you have the answers?

AfriForum and many other NGOs have long operated on the assumption that genuine development had to be based on self-help. and that this required the people's involvement in conceptualizing, designing and implementing programs. But if we are honest with ourselves. we have often honored this principle in the breach. It took us some time to take our own preaching seriously.

The World Bank. as you know, has come to the same conclusion. People's participation has not quite become a watchword in the Bank's project cycle. but it is getting there. There is greater appreciation for scaling down the scope of development programs. starting small so to speak. so that the beneficiaries are not marginalized by the sheer magnitude of an undertaking. There is also. among development professionals, a healthier respect for taking one's time. Development is a long-term proposition.

We have also learned, I hope, that development is not dependent on foreign aid. If it is. then we are in serious trouble. No developing country can possibly hope to see past levels of donor grants and concessionary lending restored. much less sustained at current levels. Although the cutbacks we have experienced in U. S. foreign assistance have been draconian and harmful they send a necessarily blunt message to aid recipients: Make better use of donor assistance. and generate more of your own development resources. Foreign assistance can only be a catalyst and a complement for local initiative.

If any one sector can fill the development gap in Africa, it ought to be the private sector. Along with farmers. you exist to VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

produce, to create, to add value. Here, too. there is mounting appreciation in Africa that the private sector needs greater room to do what it does best.

The private sector has something more essential than capital and technology; it has know-how. A budding African entrepreneur can usually find credit and obtain the right machinery. But does he or she have the experience, knowledge and

management expertise to translate plant and capital into a productive and competitive enterprise?

This seems to be a major shortcoming in developing a more dynamic African private sector. Africa's large informal sector, which is hidden from statistical view, may account for as much as half of all non-farm economic activity. This is fertile ground for nurturing the business instinct. But we are not really taking maximum advantage of this resource.

Several NGOs specialize in working with the informal and small-scale enterprise sectors. Some of you may have heard of Technoserve and the International Executive Service Corps, American NGOs which focus on providing the know-how I just mentioned. Many others. Africa are included, look for opportunities to integrate their regular development work and business enterprise. You might be interested in some examples of Africa's private sector involvement in Southern Africa alone. One of our earliest initiatives, in fact, involved an IFC supported development bank in Malawi. Africa was asked in the early 1980s to provide technical assistance to small-scale agribusiness clients of Indefund, the medium-sized loan window of Indebank, which I understand has been a very successful IFC investment. Our own experience with Indefund was productive. We helped several Malawians to develop business plans for submission to Indefund and provided them technical and managerial advice during their start-up phases. More than 800 jobs were created during our five year involvement.

More recently in Malawi, we have been working with smaller scale entrepreneurs in one district, helping them to develop marketing strategies and to use credit more efficiently. In Zambia, we have spent the past six years promoting a manually operated press for expelling oil from sunflower seed. There are now nearly 1,000 of these presses operating in villages throughout the country, with an estimated potential of at least 10,000. We have assisted several machine shops to become manufacturers of the press, and have built a national network of sales points for seeds, presses and spare parts. Sunflower production has expanded dramatically and several press owners have graduated from informal to small-scale enterprise status. We now are in the process of spinning off our oils management unit into the private sector, under the ownership of several of its Zambian staff. We are now looking at similar potential for Zambia's latent honey and beeswax industry.

In Zimbabwe, we arranged a small grant for a U.S.-educated electrical engineer and have helped him to establish a highly successful concern manufacturing solar-light assemblies for use in rural areas. He is now exploring export potential in the region. A portion of his profits, under the terms of the original grant, will eventually endow a local Africa fund to support other renewable energy enterprises.

In Namibia, we are working with several major companies, both local and multinational, to provide short-term training to improve management skills of mid-level Black staff members to qualify them for promotion in a transitional, post-apartheid working environment. We are also exploring small-scale agribusiness opportunities with emerging Namibian entrepre-

WILLIAM A. ZELLMER

neurs.

Finally, in Angola, we recently arranged a visit by representatives of a multinational which is interested in participating in the recovery of what was the world's third largest coffee industry prior to a prolonged armed conflict. We know nothing about coffee and the multinational knows little about Angola. Together, however, we may be able to collaborate on a long term initiative which could contribute to Angola's post-war economic revival. The multinational is interested in profit, of course. We are interested in helping the company to become a good corporate citizen of Angola, which could translate into setting aside a small portion of the company's income to rebuild clinics, schools and roads in coffee-growing areas. We have been flirting with such collaborative arrangements for many years, but have yet to consummate one. Part of the problem has been our lack of fluency in the language of business. Part of it is the company's lack of understanding of NGOs. That may be changing. Six of our eight country representatives in Southern Africa, for instance, have backgrounds in corporate management and finance. These are people who do speak your language.

International as well as indigenous NGOs can be a resource in identifying worthwhile investments, in strengthening the smallscale and informal sectors, in promoting domestic sav-

619  
ings, in transferring technology and management skills, in fostering the growth of a middle class.

If you leave here tonight with just one thought, let it be the idea that the private sector has a vested interest in developing long-term working relationships with NGOs. Why? Because a strong NGO community is a sign that the local body politic is no longer rejecting the transplanted notion of private versus government initiative.

Without private initiative at all levels, to anchor a sense of national values, we can hardly expect the growth in Africa of social and political systems capable of sustaining peace and development. This is the surest way, possibly the only way, to release Africa from its economic and political shackles and enable it to engage more productively in the world marketplace.

If we believe that the private sector will be pivotal in the building of functioning nation states, diverse yet stable societies and growing economies in Africa, then it is logical that we pool our resources wherever we can. We can do this on an ad hoc, one-on-one basis. But we might also consider forming country-specific coalitions, what we might term chambers of development in which NGOs, companies, trade associations and financial institutions could better target how to achieve mutually beneficial objectives.

Searching For The Soul Of Pharmacy

SPEAK UP FOR THE PATIENT

Address by WILLIAM A. ZELLMER, Vice President, Membership and Public Affairs, American Society of

Health System Pharmacists

Delivered to the Harvey A. Whitney Lecture, Annual Meeting of the American Society of Health System Pharmacists,

San Diego, California, June 5, 1996

destination will be an enhanced understanding of pharmacy as a health occupation. To reach that goal, we will walk to a few vantage points where the line of sight is just right to see some unique facets of our field.

I made two assumptions in mapping our itinerary: First, that everyone here knows the fundamental, largely unrealized, value of pharmacists. And second, that everyone here believes a vital societal purpose is served by preserving and improving our discipline as a personal health service. If my assumptions had been different. I would have chosen another path.

I have billed this excursion as "Searching for the Soul of Pharmacy" which is a metaphor for the task of professionalizing our calling. Thomas Moore, writing in *Care of the Soul*, ex-

plains:

"Soul is not a thing, but a quality or a dimension of experiencing life and ourselves. It has to do with depth, value, relatedness, heart. and personal substance. I do not use the word here as an object of religious belief or as something to do with immortality."

I am using the metaphor of soul because I believe that pharmacy cannot become a complete profession unless its practitioners have, in the words of Moore, "depth, value relatedness, heart, and personal substance." The nature of our discipline is the sum total of the inner drives \_ that is, the souls - of individual practitioners.

I invite you to join me this evening for a brief journey. Our Reflect for a moment on the great social ills that plague our times. Homelessness; drug abuse; domestic violence; children dying from gunshot wounds; the list goes on. As Daniel Patrick Moynihan has pointed out, we have reset the social norms so that atrocities such as drive-by shootings no longer evoke a sense of outrage. How should our nation address intractable social problems? Solutions that have any hope of succeeding will aim at the hearts and minds of the people.

And thus it is in pharmacy. If reshaping the profession is the goal, then the target for action must be the souls of individual practitioners.

Out with the Old, In with the New

Let's begin our trip. The first vantage point offers a look at the health care enterprise.

No matter in which direction we glance. we see a preoccupation with consolidation and reconfiguration. justified by the need to lower costs. On a macrolevel, the major targets are excess hospital capacity and overuse of medical specialists. On a microlevel. the focus is on the process of delivering care. which had become too skewed toward the convenience of providers at the expense of patients.

The experts say that health system integration will proceed until most communities have no more than three or so sources of health care. They assure us that all of the cost-cutting is a necessary interim phase until the paradise of outcomes management is attained. And, we are reminded this is private-

sector health care reform, and that is good.

Congress abandoned national health reform in 1994 in part because the public feared that a new, giant bureaucracy would be created. It is ironic that what we are getting now are swelling health care networks that are often as rigid and impersonal as any invention of government.

Private sector reform and for-profit managed care are polite terms for the rape of the health care system that had evolved after World War II. Undeniably, that system had many problems that begged to be fixed. Private insurance payment of charges and Medicare reimbursement of costs stimulated the mushrooming of specialization and the overuse of costly equipment and facilities. Health care financing carried a large overhead, which covered, in effect, public goods such as health professional education, research, public health, and uncompensated care.

But departure from the old does not in itself bestow virtue on the new. There is a distinct possibility that future social historians will characterize the current course of health care as excessively lolly motivated by power and greed and unguided by a moral compass.

Smart financial people have figured out how to make big money during the transition to a new order. Profits and stock prices of health care companies have soared. Some health care executives are rewarded with annual compensation in the tens of millions of dollars. Even among nonprofit health systems, reserves in the billions of dollars have been accumulated. Health care consultants, who are absolutely brilliant at recommending solutions that lead to more business for themselves, are flourishing. In the face of all this plunder, the quality of patient care has frequently declined, but the overall cost of health care has not.

Moreover, the nation seems to be in a state of denial about the people who lack access to basic health care services. Yet the problems of the uninsured and the underinsured simply cannot be solved by the private sector alone. The only possible solution lies in a society-wide response that entails at least some role for state and national government. Hubert Humphrey said that a nation will be judged by how it treats the disadvantaged within its borders. He was right, and we can do better. Recently, I have come to appreciate the thinking of Wendell Berry, a remarkable contemporary writer of essays, poetry, and fiction. His social criticism has renewed my awareness of the deep currents of life in our times.

Berry lives on a farm in his native Kentucky. Many of his ruminations deal with how national and international corporations and the technology they spawn are destroying communities such as his. Berry elucidates the natural connection between all life and the land. He explains how interference with that bond, in the interest of amassing corporate power and wealth, debases the lives of ordinary people. I had often thought that this analytical framework could be applied to modern health care, so I was pleased to discover a recent essay of his that makes this point explicit.

Listen to this comment by Berry:

How can cheapness be included in the criteria of medical performance? And why has it not been included before now?

I believe that the problem here is the medical industry's fixation on specialization, technology, and chemistry. As a result the modern health care system has become a way of marketing industrial products, exactly like modern agriculture, impoverishing those who pay and enriching those who are paid.

VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

It is, in other words, an industry such as industries have always been

Corporatization of health care is indeed one of the dominant realities of our times. Steadily the imperative to make a big profit is elbowing aside professional prerogatives throughout patient care. And, in the process, all health professionals are struggling to remain centered on the needs of patients.

Let's think about these observations as they relate to pharmacy. Pharmacists in all sectors of practice are enmeshed in the web of health care transformation. In hospitals and health systems, this often results in a level of Chaos that makes it difficult to concentrate on serving patients. Sometimes, amid this disorder, the only apparent plan for avoiding drug misadventures is for everyone to keep their fingers crossed. In health systems, many excellent pharmacy programs, which served patients well and built practitioner self-respect, have been dismantled.

Unfortunately, most health care settings do not have the benefit of sensitive executives who understand how to manage transitions well — who know how to lead a group wisely from letting go of the past, through the neutral zone between the old reality and the new, to the new beginning. This insensitivity contributes to widespread anxiety among pharmacists about the future.

On the other hand, this era of recreation in health care offers many opportunities for pharmacists who are enterprising and nimble. By and large, pharmacy's leadership reflects the optimism of those who understand these opportunities. At times, it seems that the happiest pharmacists on earth are those who understand the flux of health care, who have a gift for sharing their insight, and who are excited by the race to stay at the forefront of change.

I worry, though, that many of these pharmacists seem to have turned themselves over completely to a corporate agenda, which generally has an antiquated view, or no view at all, of what pharmacists can contribute to patient care. To the extent that our best and brightest practice managers are absorbed by the business of health care, a vital thread in pharmacy's soul is being unraveled.

Living, as we do, in a roiling brew of chaos and opportunity, we need to discipline ourselves at times to withdraw and look to the inner self. We may then see that the seductiveness of the new threatens to blind us to our primary obligations to the welfare and safety of patients. We may then see the pain of fellow travelers and reach out to them with a supportive hand. We may even detect in ourselves and colleagues a doubting moment about the wisdom of our course, which may in turn give us the courage to challenge small lunacies in our corner of the world. If practitioners do these things, they will be building their depth, value, relatedness, heart, and personal substance. They will be strengthening the soul of pharmacy.

Madison Avenue and the Pharmacist

The next stop on our journey will be a short one. We will pause at a spot that offers a perspective on some aspects of the marketing of drug products.

Most of us became pharmacists during an era when the primary marketing target of the industry was the physician. Convince the doctor to prescribe a product, and the battle was won. Now the target is shifting. It is becoming the consumer. Hence, we are seeing a tremendous upsurge in direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription drug products, the creation of over-the-counter versions of prescription medicines.

WILLIAM A. ZELLMER

industry funding of patient advocacy groups, drug-company sponsorship of behavior modification programs designed to increase patient compliance, and the construction of disease-specific patient databases that permit a company to write or call individuals who have an illness that corresponds to its product line.

This marketing shift is part of a broader attempt by the industry to control all steps in the process from discovery of a drug to its consumption by the consumer. Manifestations of this goal include restricted product distribution schemes, disease management programs, and diversification into pharmacy benefit management, mail order pharmacy, and specialized health care services.

Implicit in the push for consumer-focused marketing is the idea that advertising and labeling can cover everything a person needs to know about a drug product. This is quite contrary to the scientific knowledge, experience, and beliefs of pharmacists. Somehow, practicing pharmacists must position themselves as a buffer between Madison Avenue and the patient. This is already being done by health system pharmacists who are involved in developing drug-use policy. But the role of the frontline practitioner as a counter balance to drug hucksterism is largely undefined.

There are no overt incentives for practicing pharmacists and their organizations to cry out with the truth about the need for caution and skepticism in all medication use. The motivation for doing so must come from keen thinking about the subtleties of drug marketing and their implications for public health. If pharmacists are passive about drug-company manipulation of consumer medication practices, then any search for the soul of pharmacy will become irrelevant.

Pharmacist Allegiance

We will move now to the final stop in our stroll, which will give us a look at pharmacy practice itself.

The most truthful thing I can say about pharmacy practice is this: It is an occupation psychically bound to the act of providing medications to patients, but which knows that it must find a new reason for being.

There is hope in pharmacy's recognition that it must change. And there is hope in the fact that many pharmacists have rallied around pharmaceutical care, which has a strong moral and philosophical foundation. But there is no guarantee that this hope will lead, any time soon, to a secure place in health care. Let me tell you a story about Jonas Salk. Dr. Salk was the University of Pittsburgh virologist who developed the first safe and effective polio vaccine, and he was widely admired for that achievement. He used to deflect public adulation by referring to a Harvard scientist, John F. Enders, and saying of him, "He threw a long forward pass, and I caught it." It was Enders who had developed the method of culturing polio viruses that made Salk's achievement possible. Enders threw a long forward pass and Salk caught it.

The history of pharmacy records some long forward passes but also documents many fumbles and incompletes. In particular, what come to mind are this century's numerous efforts to marshal support for fundamental reforms of pharmacy practice and education based on systematic studies of the field. To be sure, these efforts influenced the upgrading of pharmacy education from a two-year minimum requirement in 1907 to five years in 1960. But, unlike medicine, pharmacy has never found the resources or the resolve to sustain for long any well-organized, precisely targeted reform that made a difference in the

621  
status of the occupation.

The heritage of pharmacy is a motley mix of business and practitioner interests. For a long time now, the majority of practicing pharmacists have been employees, not pharmacy owners. But the practitioner community has made very little progress in articulating its unique interests as a health occupation \_ interests that are quite different from those of the busi-



ness, institutional, or corporate entities that employ pharmacists.

Practitioner organizations should be dauntless in making this distinction to public policy makers and to the standard-setting bodies in practice and education. The essential difference between the pharmacist and the pharmacy facility should be reinforced whenever a health consumer and a practitioner interact. It should be crystal clear in those encounters that the pharmacist has no allegiance greater than that to the individual being served.

Those instances in which patients actually see pharmacists occur mostly in drug stores. There the pharmacists are, sometimes on a platform, sometimes behind glass, busy, isolated, in their sanctuaries. But at least they can be spotted. That is more than generally can be said for pharmacists in hospitals.

The law of the land says that pharmacists must offer to talk to ambulatory patients about their prescription medications. What a priceless opportunity for the pharmacist to demonstrate a responsibility to the patient. and to reinforce that fidelity again and again. It was a dark hour for pharmacy when, in an apparent telepathic wave of group think, the owners and managers of community pharmacies decided to obey merely the letter of the law, not its spirit. At prescription counters across the nation, clerks are asking customers, "You don't really want to bother a pharmacist with questions about your medicines, do you? Then please sign here so we won't get into trouble with the law?"

Although the importance of this issue is self-evident, there is little fervor among pharmacists anywhere for changing the practice. But unless pharmacists begin showing their souls at the prescription counter and the outpatient window, pharmacy will be haunted to its grave by this missed opportunity.

Let's shift our sight for a moment to acute-care pharmacy practice. Rampant lip service is given here to pharmaceutical care. Yet the concept has been very difficult for hospital pharmacists to implement because it calls for a direct relationship with the patient. This characteristic of pharmaceutical care encounters five major barriers in hospitals.

First, in the hospital, patients clearly "belong" to the attending physician. There is not a tradition in hospitals of nonphysicians consulting independently with the patient.

Second, in the culture of hospital pharmacy, the practitioner is oriented toward the hospital and its rules, not toward the personal health needs of the patient. In other words, the pharmacist's covenant has been with the hospital, not the patient.

Third, clinical pharmacy, as it evolved in hospitals, has been oriented toward the physician, not the patient directly. Here the pharmacist's covenant is with the doctor.

Fourth, the reward system in hospital pharmacy for so long has been tied to efficiency and accuracy in drug distribution that pharmacists have been much too slow to turn over this work to well-trained technicians.

Fifth, hospital pharmacy still suffers from a vestige of an earlier age when it attracted practitioners who wanted refuge

from the patient contact of community pharmacy. Unfortunately for us today, there is no tradition in hospitals of pharmacists talking with patients. Even when pharmacists accompany physicians on rounds, they are often there incognito, under cover as just another medical consultant. Most hospitalized patients have absolutely no awareness of how pharmacists are contributing to their care.

This analysis can be boiled down to the fact that hospital pharmacists, including clinical practitioners, have defined their roles primarily in terms of technical competence, not in terms of patient care. This is not a patina that can be rubbed away lightly: it emanates from deep within hospital pharmacists. For that reason, I think we have greatly underestimated the magnitude of the paradigm shift that pharmaceutical care embodies. This concept of practice poses as great a leap for hospital pharmacy as the shift in the world of astronomy from Ptolemy to Copernicus, or in the field of physics from Newton to Einstein. It will take much greater time and effort to transform acute-care pharmacy practice in the direction of pharmaceutical care than most of us have imagined.

#### Nourishing the Soul of Pharmacy

I willingly concede that for every case of disappointment I cited this evening, just as many hopeful examples about the vitality of pharmacy could be readily found. By no means is everything doom and gloom in pharmacy practice. But I had four reasons for leading you down the particular path I chose. First, I believe that we tend to deny the true state of pharmacy practice.

Second, I believe that denial is not a sound basis on which to build our future.

Third, I believe that the fate of pharmacy practice in all settings is linked, and that specialized areas should not isolate themselves from the discipline as a whole.

And fourth, I believe that we need to work on nourishing the soul of pharmacy, as reflected in the orientation of individual practitioners. If we are to save this occupation for the benefit of patients.

How do we nourish the soul of pharmacy? I do not profess to have the answer to that simple question. But let me suggest several ideas that may be worthy of consideration.

1 Encourage ambulatory patients to select a personal pharmacist. Not a pharmacy, but a pharmacist.

2 Teach pharmacists how to recognize and resist corporate edicts, both blatant and subtle, that undermine their ability to care for patients.

3 Recognize and honor pharmacists who have demonstrated an authentic professional commitment to patients. We need more heroes in the frontline ranks of pharmacy.

4 Increase efforts to develop and enrich the work of

#### VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

frontline pharmacists in all practice settings. Let's not become distracted from the fact that the true nature of our discipline is defined in the everyday interface between pharmacists and patients.

5 Limit entry to colleges of pharmacy to students who have already demonstrated their capacity for compassion and caring.

6 Develop a public report card on colleges of pharmacy and postgraduate residency programs that rates their ability to produce outstanding patient care pharmacists.

7 Foster a nationwide dialogue among pharmacists and physicians and consumer representatives about the problems related to medication use and what these three groups can do together to make the situation better.

8 Systematically focus the immense but fragmented continuing education resources of pharmacy on the knowledge and skills that will be needed by practitioners to make our discipline a caring profession.

9 Create a high-profile center supported by pharmacists and consumers to study societal medication-use issues and make

recommendations for resolving them. Include in the scope of this center the effects of industry marketing practices.

10 Put as much energy into long-term planning for pharmacy as is put into short-term strategizing. Let's begin to outline, through our professional organizations, what we can achieve over a generation or two, not just within the next 12 months. Let's see if we can coordinate the planning efforts of national and state practitioner organizations and the academic community.

In drawing this journey to a close, let me remind you of Thomas Moore's definition of soul. He says, "It has to do with depth, value, relatedness, heart, and personal substance?"

People want and need pharmacists with those characteristics - pharmacists with soul.

Let's dedicate ourselves to remaking this occupation of ours into a profession that gives people what they want and need. This is not an agenda that we can assign to someone else. Each of us must take personal responsibility for making this happen.

Individually, we can examine and adjust the focus of our own work. We can support and encourage our colleagues in the same pursuit. We can create and support collectively, through our professional organizations, long-term efforts that build the soul of pharmacy.

Above all, we can speak up.

Speak up for the patient.

Speak up for safe medication handling practices.

Speak up for medication therapy that makes sense.

We can do this. We must do this.

Growth And The Road To Cyberspace

WE MUST TAKE RESPONSIBILITY

Address by DANA G. MEAD, Chairman and CEO, Teneco and Chairman of NAM  
Delivered to the Economic Club of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan, May 15, 1996  
to the Cyber-Age (or the knowledge economy as some label it) and some of the challenges we face on what I call the Road to Cyberspace.

Today I'm going to talk about the transition of our economy  
As many of us have observed, there is sometimes a cross-over between what's virtual and what's real.

. By the virtual reality of the future - for example that we will be able, using our computers, to buy tickets for a trip to

DANA G. MEAD

say, San Francisco, to book a meal at a Greek restaurant on a Saturday night, to look at the menu, the dining room, to read the food critics' review, pick a table, order ahead, even talk to your waiter \_ all of it in the virtual world of Cyberspace. It sounds wonderful, but I'm an industrialist and also a realist. I keep thinking someone has to manufacture the tables, the silverware and the napkins; someone has to produce the food; someone has to put the wine in the bottle, and someone has to get the product to the customer.

The transition to the Cyber-Age is proving to be a painful process.

The New York Times" had a seven part series on it. And the latest issue of Foreign Affairs" has the following on its cover: "The world may be moving inexorably towards one of those tragic moments that will lead historians to ask, why was nothing done in time?"

These articles and many like them point up the fact that our transition to the Cyber-Age holds huge potential for problems, big problems ... economic insecurity, worker anxiety, social displacement and disruption and the very damaging political repercussions that may well result.

This issue is not immune from political demagoguery \_ witness the campaign of Pat Buchanan, an old acquaintance of mine from my White House days.

The difficulty of this transition also has not escaped the fine political instincts of President Clinton. He now has his Labor Secretary, Robert Reich, out front as his point man basically polarizing the issue pitting managers against workers, investors against labor, government against corporations, larger corporations against small ones and so on.

And although the rhetoric has cooled a bit, organized labor, the media and others have picked up the themes and run with them.

This transition \_ in all of its ramifications \_ is perhaps the greatest domestic challenge we face in this country over the next decade. And it's a case of how we get there being just as important as being there."

If we do not do it right, we are going to end up with all the things I've mentioned earlier \_ paying a hard political, economic and social price and causing historians to question why we didn't do something?

Despite all the talk of our virtual future? the Road to Cyberspace has to go through places like Newport News, Virginia, where ships are built; through Cozad, Nebraska where they make shock absorbers ... through Racine, Wisconsin, where they bolt tractors together; Counce, Tennessee where they make linerboard, and of course, through this city of Detroit and its environs.

That's just an oblique way of saying that we must find some way to use the vast experience and talent of a non-knowledge economy workforce while we move to one with workers and managers who are cyber-ready and to do so without losing our competitiveness.

To get to the knowledge economy of the future is going to require huge resources, huge amounts of money \_ in people, time and effort.

That is why economic growth is so important to our transition. Unless we can achieve growth at high enough levels to generate the revenues that both government and business need - and it may not matter if it is government or the private sector that is spending the money \_ we won't be able to pay for the dislocations in our labor force to pay for the training and

623  
retraining we need to equip our workforce with skills for jobs in the CyberAge to establish effective safety nets for the inevitable dislocations and economic hardships.

We also have to pay for all the new Cyber-systems that will raise productivity \_ but which are already proving to be tremendously costly.

Has anybody here lately put in a new software system? Is

there anybody here who thought it was Cheap? Is there anybody here who does not believe that the next time is going to be even more expensive and complex?

And regarding the growth issue, we are facing big time problems.

There is a phalanx of "Experts" \_ predominantly ill-trained economists who think our current 2.2 percent growth rate is all that we can manage without inflation.

They include people at the Federal Reserve, the OMB, the Congressional Budget Office, the blue chip forecast and respected academics throughout the country this, in the face of our average historic growth (since 1870) of 3.5 percent.

In fact, I have to tell you that in the last 6 months, as we in the NAM have been out beating the drum for growth in the three percent range, there has been a disturbing closing of the ranks in the academic community around the view that the country cannot sustain a rate of growth higher than the low two percent range without triggering rampant inflation.

I find this scary.

There are, however, some growth hawks fighting the conventional wisdom ... influential and respected people like Milton Friedman, Lester Thurow and the man who saved New York City, Felix Rohatyn.

They see the low growth argument for the eco-babble it is.

In fact, some of us have been stunned at the number of people who see growth not as a logical economic argument for more investment, greater competitiveness and ultimately, higher living standards, but as a means to an evil end.

These are the conspiracy junkies who see growth as a plot by greedy corporations and the wealthy of the world to turn the United States into a plutocracy. Felix Rohatyn's recent column on growth in the Wall Street Journal has elicited almost unbelievable mail \_ accusing him of selling out his Democratic (big D) principles and attempting to alter the whole principle of income redistribution!

On the other hand (always an important phrase for an economist), there are those who sincerely believe that higher growth will cause inflation.

With the low inflation and low unemployment to date. I think that's an unfounded fear \_ a little like the cat who once sat on a hot stove. The cat will never sit on a hot stove again, but hell never sit on a cold one, either. The stove of inflation is cold. Now I am not ready to declare the death of inflation. I think it is dangerous, I think it is a problem, I think it has to be watched.

I also am not ready to sign up with those who think zero inflation is a legitimate goal for this economy, because I think that is dangerous also.

One of things not being fully accounted for in the inflation debate is the result of increasing productivity \_ gains in output from what is known as "technology deepening."

What this means is, as we drive systems and innovations deeper and deeper into our organizations, we are getting a large boost in productivity - and often we don't even know it.

For example. Tenneco has increased productivity in one of our papermills by 9% in the last 3 years without adding a dollar

of investment.

We have not hired more people to do it.

We have not inflated the cost of labor per ton of output. We have done it solely by improving our processes.

Globalization \_ and the fierce competition it has spawned - is another effective inflation fighter.

Most people do not understand how really global most businesses are. Last year our Newport News Shipbuilding division signed a contract with a Greek shipping firm for four double-hulled tankers basically an export item.

To help build those tankers. we probably have two thousand suppliers \_ small to medium size shops making parts for the ships. And if you asked them if they were exporters, most of them would probably say. no, they're suppliers to Newport News.

The intensity of global price competition is greater than many people think \_ it is not just the big multinationals, its many of the firms who supply to them in countries across the world.

So much of what we are fighting in the halls of government and in the Federal Reserve is the misuse and misreading of economic data that don't take into account technology and globalization.

For example. the Federal Reserve and the rest of the low-growth crowd have been using an economic indicator called NAIRU \_ the awkward acronym for the even more awkward phrase it stands for: the non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment.

Stated simply, NAIRU holds that when you go below a certain level of unemployment. the cost of labor will go up, triggering price increases on products and a spiral of inflation. This has been the single most important indicator used by the Fed in monitoring inflation.

Of course, they get very upset with me. because I have been running around the country saying that NAIRU is to economics what the Nehru jacket is to fashion: Outdated.

I say that because the Nairu has been systematically discredited.

People once thought the NAIRU was 6.1% unemployment.

When unemployment got to 6%, the economists all said inflation is coming \_ sort of like Chicken Little. the sky is falling.

But we had no inflation. Then unemployment dropped to 5.8% in early 1995. and people thought, the sky really is falling this time. So the Fed jacked up interest rates.

But low and behold, there was still no inflation.

NAIRU is like predicting the End of the World (or the Red Sox winning the World Series): if you predict it long enough. you'll eventually be right.

My point is, if you're going to follow economic indicators. they've got to be the right indicators.

Another example of a dubious indicator used by the Fed is Changes in inventories and absolute levels of inventories. Basically, when inventories are high, growth and inflation stay low. When they're low. growth and inflation go up. That's the conventional wisdom.

I played the skunk at the Sunday picnic the other day. I asked one of these economy watchers if he takes into consideration the fact that every business in America has tried to reduce its inventories to shorten up its cycle time.

I explained. for instance. that in our auto parts business, we often build a focus plant right next to our customers plant. so we can deliver parts for a particular platform in a matter of hours.

#### VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

So I said to the inflation fighter, if you think that no inventory in the auto plant indicates runaway economic growth, you are using the wrong indicator.

My point is, nobody really understands the impact of the changes that business \_ particularly manufacturers \_ have brought to this economy.

What is the impact of massive increases in productivity?

What is the impact of Just-in-Time inventory? What is the impact of reengineering \_ which is a fancy word for eliminating the things that customers won't pay for?

We have to begin to talk about these changes and their impact.

And it's going to be uncomfortable for everyone.

Uncomfortable for industrialists like me because frankly, it conjures up the idea that part of this increased productivity may be from eliminating jobs.

We have to stand up to that issue. If our companies are to remain competitive in a global economy, we have to eliminate jobs that are no longer delivering value to customers but at the same time, prepare people for jobs that are delivering value. There is real irony in some of this jobs-and-growth debate.

I was at a dinner in Washington a couple of weeks ago and a cabinet member got up and spoke proudly of the fact that the current administration has eliminated hundreds of thousands of government jobs.

Yet when it happens in the private sector, some government leader calls it corporate greed and labels CEOs "corporate killers".

So we have to take a very hard look at our economy at the impact of the changes with an eye towards making this transition to the Cyber-Age a successful one.

To do that we have to focus on real issues, not phony ones that make good political rhetoric.

For example, the Secretary of Labor (I seem to be picking on him a lot) talks about the decrease in real incomes for the average wage earner during the past 20 years. And he usually says it in the same breath as phrases like "corporate welfare" and "Class warfare."

This is all very polarizing stuff, and it makes good sound bites \_ which partly explains why many Americans are confused and discouraged.

They might feel they're doing better than 20 years ago, but they're being told they're worse off.

A report by Michael Cox and Richard Alm of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas puts some perspective on this paradox. Alm and Cox used quality of life measures to compare 1970 and 1990. They found some interesting things.

I'll reel off a few of them:

The average size of a new home went from 1500 square feet to 2100 square feet.

People using computers rose from 100,000 to 76 million.

Households with VCRs went from zero to 67 million.

Attendance at symphonies and concerts, 13 million to 44 million.

The amount of time worked to buy gas for a 100-mile trip, from 49 minutes to 31 minutes.

People finishing high school: 52% to 78%.

People finishing college: 14% to 24%.

And life expectancy: 71 to 75 years.

These figures cast into doubt the idea that life has gotten worse for most Americans. And it warrants our taking a second look at the statistics so often cited by the doom and gloomers of

DANA G. MEAD

this 7 to 10 percent decline in wages.

When you take into account things like the CPIs overstatement of inflation by one-half to one percent; the declining size of families; the growth of non-wage compensation like health care and pensions most workers have seen compensation rise by up to 23%.

You take a further look, and you see the biggest bite in real income has come from taxes. In 1955, taxes took an average 27% of household income; today the figure is 38%.

At NAM, we recommend a number of things the government can do to help this economy achieve higher growth: deficit reduction, tort and regulatory reform, paying down the national debt, many others.

But the first among equals is tax reform that will encourage investment over consumption. This will take real leadership because tax reform will not immediately produce growth.

And when it does kick in, it will probably first benefit upper income Americans more which means there will be plenty of howling about the rich getting richer.

So what we at NAM have been suggesting is something that reaches well beyond tax reform, and that is a new covenant between business, labor, and government a compact of mutual support to pursue pro-growth policies.

One of the ironies of the recent militancy of the labor movement is its timing, because American industry has finally figured out that within our plants, we have people with 35 or 40 years experience who know a hell of a lot more about how to run that corrugator or know how to run that paper machine than any of us wearing white shirts and suspenders.

For years we have not utilized that talent. Now that were reaching out and doing so. we are confronting a huge backlash from unions.

Why? Well, if you think about it, when you bring labor and management together on a project, you are basically supplanting the unions conventional role which was to communicate with their members, to decide what work they would do and to organize the work.

So they see the team concept as a direct threat to their existence. Making matters worse is the recent NLRB ruling that supports a 1937 labor law that forming a labor/management team in a non-union facility is against the law.

We are being challenged in manufacturing facilities all over the United States, any time we put teams together\_ teams that are an absolute prerequisite to our staying competitive with the rest of the world.

That's part of what I mean by forging a new covenant.

Another part of that covenant has to do with the whole notion of gain sharing. This is a huge issue.

For years enlightened managers have tried to find ways to share company gains with unionized workers. and it has been very difficult to do so because it was often looked upon as a way to circumvent the contract \_ and their control.

Now let me talk about worker anxiety.

Though there is a lot of misinformation and disinformation out there, the fact is, worker anxiety exists, and it's not a mirage. There are reasons for anxiety. and here I depart from the party line, and believe it or not, I agree with the Secretary of Labor. It is a real problem. It includes things like people losing their jobs (and no new job prospects), their loss of benefits. and being unable to pay for their children's education.

Restructuring is going to continue \_ in whatever name you call it \_ and jobs will both be lost and Changed.

625

The reason is, the old "I don't look back" syndrome \_ someone is gaining on you. For every business. there are a lot of someones across the globe catching up in places like India. China, Brazil and Slovenia. This is not likely to change. One of the consequences of this intense competition is job displacement. Twenty-five years ago, if you were a lathe operator, you had a skill a marketable skill.



If you lost your job, the Chances of your being out of work for very long were pretty low. because there were still jobs for lathe operators being created.

Now if you are a lathe operator. 50 years old. and you lose your job, the jobs that are being created are for people who can use distributive process control, or work in computer programming, or service robotics.

The skills of the old jobs being lost don't match the skills of the new jobs being created.

So we have to change our mindset. We can no longer guarantee a lifetime job.

We must begin to do what we can to guarantee lifetime employment by changing the skill set of people as they work for us.

We also have to be realistic. We cannot convert every welder at our shipyard to a computer jockey \_ that won't work.

But we can do things to give that individual a certain skill set that will increase the probability that he or she will have the ability to land a job in this quote-unquote "knowledge" economy, if and when their current job disappears.

Business, labor and government must cooperate to provide the training and also pay for it. For its part, business needs to double what it spends from 1.5% to 3%.

Meanwhile. workers \_ organized and unorganized \_ must be flexible. They must look upon their careers like opera singers \_ every 3 or 4 years developing a new repertoire because a four-year-old repertoire is ancient history.

Like the opera singer, nobody is going to hire you for a new role unless you have learned the music. And there's more and more to learn with each passing year.

What are the ramifications of employment security as opposed to job security?

Well. for one thing, it means we are fast becoming a nation of job hoppers which gets me to another area of cooperation: portability of benefits.

There is no reason we cannot develop a system of benefits people can take from job to job.

There is no reason why a worker should not take the equity built up in his or her pension fund to the next job.

There is no reason we cannot cooperate on benefits to help educate our workers children.

And there is no reason we can't give our employees a larger piece of the action in our companies \_ to align the owners. the managers and the workers' interests.

When we brought our Case tractor division public two years ago, we gave every single employee % right down to the guy bolting tapping screws on a tractor. options on a hundred shares. Today those options are worth roughly \$3,000.

Those are some of the things that we have to do to make this transition to the Cyber-Age -. and then succeed when we get there.

But I'll remind you that the Road to Cyberspace won't be a smooth one. It has to pass through every factory. every union hall, every board room in the country \_ and also through Washington DC. and all the state capitols.

This is not just an issue of corporate responsibility." as many would like to call it. but international responsibility." It is going to take true leadership in the White House. Congress. business. and labor to make the transition successful.

#### VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

And I think the jury is still out on whether we have that leadership in any one or all of these institutions . . . whether our leaders are ready to step up to the challenges and the risks that lie ahead.

Women As Players

#### THE TIME IS NOW

Address by MARILYN CARLSON NELSON, Vim Chair, The Carlson Company  
Delivered to f/It' Women III F())dseri'i('(', Atlanta, Georgia, April 1/, 1996  
bank you for that kind introduction. I'm honored to be here and to be representing the Carlson Companies. And I was thrilled that your organization \_ Women in Foodservice \_ selected me. a woman, as your keynote speaker. Thank you.

Every honor. I'm convinced. which goes to an individual woman. brings honor to us all. So, I hope each and every one of you shares this honor with me today This honor belongs to all of us who've made it to rooms like this. Let's give ourselves a round of applause.

After I received this invitation and saw that we would all be coming to Atlanta. I began to think about the Olympics. In a few months # less than 99 days \_ athletes will come from around the world to Atlanta.

These men and women have invested so much of their lives for one thing: And that thing is the chance to show what they can do in five or six or seven minutes or in nine seconds or less.

And when they come here. all that will matter will be that: Their performance.

What won't matter is what they intended to do.

What they wanted to do.

Or what they could have done.

In the Olympics, there are no excuses. It's all about performance.

Remember when Tonya Harding complained about her tight Shoelaces?

That excuse didn't fly.

Harding lost.

The judges looked only at her performance.

You know the official Olympics isn't too far from where you and I are today \_ in this time of global competition and breakthrough technologies.

In our own lives today we are playing our own version of the Olympics every day. aren't we? Our superiors, colleagues. subordinates, clients. friends and even our families judge us on our performance. They look at the results.

That's because in the information age. no one has the time any more or the margin of error to think about what we intended or what we could have accomplished had we more resources. Either I wrote and faxed the proposal by 6 o'clock Warsaw time or I didn't.

There's no more claiming: The dog ate my homework. Not even for our kids. Today I want to look at performance from a few perspectives,

At my company A Carlson \_ we've been looking at our performance for a while. We believe we can improve our performance. We believe we can become better players - and at the same time improve society. That's why we're using all kinds of methods to help us analyze how we do what we do.

For instance. we're working with the thinking of Stephen Covey.

Ever hear of Covey?

Covey's been on the best-seller list for years. Years! He wrote THE SEVEN HABITS OF HIGHLY EFFECTIVE

PEOPLE and other books which have changed how millions of people and thousands of organizations see and think about

themselves and their environment.

Coveyls genius is that he can get right to the heart of perform\_ance.

He knows. for instance. that unless you have the end in mind when you begin. you wont get anywhere.

Covey also knows that our biggest obstacles arenit sexism or the economy. Covey know that our biggest obstacles are ourselves.

Once we master ourselves the obstaclesjust seem to float away. Today lets look at performance from three perspec-tives.

The first perspective is how we are doing as a society. The second perspective is how our companies are doing.

And third. is how we are doing as woman. Particularly I want to explore how the most successful of us - the women who get the promotions \_ are doing it.

First is society.

Did you see the movie "Apollo 13?" Remember how all America was united in its concern about the three lost astro-nauts?

The spirit of that togetherness was so touching because we donit have much of that unity now. do we?

In place of unity it's special interests.

his the information haves versus the information have-nots. his the immigrants who arrived in America a generation ago versus immigrants who arrived yesterday.

And. yes. its men versus women.

Probably not since the Civil War have we experienced so much conflict and so much self-righteous thinking.

Right now as a society too many of us are performing as solo aets. Thatis a very hard way to proceed. And its pretty lonely;

Lets go back to "Apollo 13." Remember that scene when a simulation of all the equipment that is on the space rocket is put on a table. A team is told to use that equipment \_\_ and only that equipment % to build a device that will take care of the carbon dioxide aboard the ship.

They do it!

It works.

MARILYN CARLSON NELSON

Three lives are saved.

And remember how proud the team was!

When's the last time we have felt that proud in our personal lives? Maybe the team we were on was our own family. Maybe our husband got laid off and as a group we pulled together. And we made it. Maybe we relocated to a city on the coast or in the midwest. And as a group we made it.

How can we bring that same team spirit back to society?

Not too long ago a mother who lost a child in a drunk-driving accident sat home and cried. Alone.

Then mothers got the idea that they could do more than cry.

They could get together and change how an entire nation thought about drinking and driving. And they did just that. Today Mothers Against Drunk Driving or MADD is one of the most successful organizations in America. In terms of results, its right up there with GE and Chrysler.

Imagine if everyone in this room started her own version of MADD? Imagine how much members of those groups would get out of working together?

In Greenwich, Connecticut there's a group of mostly women who started an organization called "Adopt a Dog." And boy do folks adopt those dogs. Every day Adopt A Dog has a long-winded classified in the newspaper describing Ginger or Buster who needs a home. On Sundays Adopt A Dog has a big picture of the dog and discusses all the reasons that the dog would make a nice companion. People look forward to reading these ads. Procter & Gamble couldn't do any better in its advertising. There are an infinite number of teams we can form back in our communities. All we need is the belief \_ the belief that we can perform better if we work together.

Do you realize that Harvard University, the Salvation Army, Forward Atlanta, the Museum of Modern Art and even the Olympics began as someone's idea.

Then people got together.

And the rest is a history of amazing performance.

Okay, that's the big picture: Society. Now let's look at where we work:

Corporate America.

Right now performance in corporate America is being judged primarily on the basis of ROI or ROE. Shareholders are sitting in the catbird seat. Through downsizing, many corporations are adding quick fixes to the bottom line. Lay off 10,000 employees and the security analysts will probably say that happy days are back again for you and your company.

Anything wrong with this?

I believe yes. I believe that while we need to be efficient and competitive, we also need to take other dimensions into account.

At Carlson we have the Pyramid of Excellence. And we're committed to it. See, we believe that business is a system. All the parts are interrelated. If any part of that system is dysfunctional, the whole thing will eventually go kaput.

That's why at Carlson we use the Pyramid of Excellence.

Through the Pyramid of Excellence, we see to it that all constituencies get represented. Shareholders, the owners of the business, yes, they're represented. But so are employees, customers, vendors and the communities.

When corporations don't take into account all these constituencies, capitalism starts looking pretty bad.

Did you read that series on downsizing in THE NEW YORK TIMES? It was chilling. Whenever I picked up the phone someone wanted to discuss what was in THE TIMES. We all

627

identified - with the fear.

Do you remember the man in the series who went from \$130,000 to \$30,000?

Hey what does that do to his purchasing power and the overall standard of living in the U.S.?

Henry Ford's capitalist genius was not that he conceived of the assembly line. Ford's capitalist genius was that he paid his

workers the unheard-of wage of \$5 a day. That jump started the middle class.

In the TIMES series, corporate America was the villain.

The bad guy.

The snake.

That's too bad.

Remember when corporate America was the good guy?

Remember how, after World War II, GM and Coca-Cola and Colgate-Palmolive brought about affluence \_ and excellence.

If you were trained by one of these corporations your skills were world class. You were hot stuff when you went back to your reunion.

Well, the dark side of capitalism isn't going by unnoticed by the employees.

At General Motors the workers at parts plants said, "No way are you going to contract out any more of our work?"

They went on strike.

That strike cost GM more than \$30 million dollars a day.

Customers and communities are also feeling the brunt of what's going on in corporate America. For instance, to shore up the bottom line, companies are cutting back on customer service and donations to the community. Run a focus group with customers and people from the community and you'll get an earful.

So, what should corporate America do? I have some ideas.

One, the powers-that-be have to recognize that shareholders are just one constituency. Today's top companies struggle to keep all their constituencies happy. Just think about Microsoft. Its head Bill Gates truly believes that he needs to pull together all constituencies to remain the leader in software. Gates is probably the greatest systems thinker in the world.

Two, companies must do things in ways that show employees and customers that they matter. When Lou Gerstner decided to restore bonuses at IBM he sure did give a message to employees: You are valuable. When Nordstrom takes back shoes, even after you've worn them, they also send out a clear message: The customer counts.

Three, corporate leaders need to recognize that companies, like citizens, have a responsibility to their neighbors, their communities and their vendors. They have to forget that eliminating jobs by downsizing, closing plants, contracting out or shipping work to low cost areas abroad to jump start their stock can be costly in the long run.

For example, we're seeing the death of loyalty. The workplace, even at nonprofits, is now primarily about Looking Out for Number One. Wasn't it supposed to be the mission which motivated folks? Now if you're focused on the mission you're seen as naive. Shame on us.

And the new breed of capitalism is also being noticed in Washington. The Buchanans on the right and Kennedys on the left are already driving legislative proposals to restrict corporate autonomy. Thanks to that one dimensional focus on shareholders, corporations could be inviting in another era of stringent regulations. It will take decades and billions of dollars to eventually get rid of those regulations. Meanwhile, those regula-

tions could hobble American business in the global marketplace. Isn't it amazing that an institution like corporate America which had been so great could do itself in?

Now let's look at our performance as women.

The food industry has been good to many of you. Maybe you're not as far as you'd like but you've gotten to this room and rooms like this one. That's an accomplishment.

Also you're respected in your field.

You have hopes and dreams. You are convinced that even better things are ahead for you. Remember when many women lost their hopes and dreams soon after they married? No more. Were become incorrigible dreamers.

The most exciting part of our dreams is that so much of our professional future is within our control. Oh, sure, companies can downsize. And we're out. The guy or woman who hired us can get fired and oops we're out the door. We can get scapegoated for a mistake. And our confidence takes a beating.

But, despite all these bumps in the road, we still have ourselves. And those selves can be dynamic players in the professional world.

I've done some research. Informal research but still research. I've thought about all the women I know who've been promoted and I tried to figure out what they had in common. Let's look at some of these qualities.

First of all, women who have been promoted have a mindset of abundance, not scarcity. They focus on all the new jobs which will come from a new technology. Not how many jobs will be lost. They gravitate towards growth areas in the company. In short, they're gutsy and upbeat. And plenty hopeful. They're the type to join start-ups which have outrageously successful Initial Public Offerings or IPOs. And they get filthy rich. Along with getting a promotion.

Two, they are current. They read WIRED and FAST COMPANY along with THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

They turn on MTV as often as they turn on 11Murder She Wrote."

They get a friend to show them how they can navigate the Internet and a year ago they suggested that their company put a home page in the Web.

In short, they keep up.

They're there. Knock, knock. Yes, there's someone home.

And she's plenty alert.

Three, they aren't scared of feedback. They're not defensive. They're constructive. They make sure they get that feedback from bosses, colleagues, subordinates, customers and vendors. That's how they can keep reinventing themselves. None of these women will ever be described as tiout of touch?

Four, they are able to see the big-big picture. They keep in touch with business trends enough to know what skills and what kind of person will be valued in business.

On the other hand, women who don't get promoted can't see beyond their little work area. They micromanage their careers and obsess about what the company is doing wrong. My advice to them is: Lighten UP.

Five, women who get ahead fit in. They're smart enough to get into a corporate culture which takes advantage of their strengths and doesn't highlight their weaknesses. Someone might do very well at Coca-Cola but be fired at Pepsi-Cola. Those are two vastly different corporate cultures. If you're in the wrong corporate culture, look for a better fit.

Six, women who get promoted are sensitive to the needs of VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

other people.

Today we call that ability Emotional intelligence?

The woman who is emotionally intelligent can put herself in the shoes of her bosses, colleagues and subordinates.

On the other hand, I know of many women who don't get promoted who fixate on themselves rather than focus on the needs of others. No one helps them move upward. People

figure: IIHey she doesn't care about me. Why should I care about herXI

Seven. women who get promoted prepare for the promotion ahead of time. They make a strategic plan for their career and then begin dressing, speaking and thinking like a person at the next level. Eventually someone notices how this woman personifies what is needed at the next level and promotes her. Careers just don't happen. You have to strategically plan your plays.

And, eight, women who get promoted know what counts. They don't exhaust themselves doing everything superb or pleasing every one. They're not good little girls. They're women with the courage to make priorities. If they've chosen the right priorities, they'll be noticed and promoted.

At Carlson. Sue Gordon is in human resources and she's in our audience today. Sue. will you stand up.

When Sue started with Carlson 20 years ago the Radisson Hotel had three hotels in the United States. The hotel chain was provincial. Sue was the director of human resources. Over those 20 years Sue became the vice president of human resources. But the real promotions were not reflected in her title. The real promotions were in the significant increases in her responsibility.

Sue now handles human-resources issues for 330 hotels around the world and three cruise ships.

In my years working with Sue I've noticed that she has all the qualities other promotable women do. She also has done a number of other things right. Let's look at those things. When Sue came to work with us. she was eager to learn the hotel business. She didn't come in and try to identify what was wrong with the business. Or how the business could earn more profits. Or how much better she could do than the powers-that-be.

Humbly. Sue learned every facet of the hotel business. Then she started to make suggestions. There are no shortcuts. You have to learn the business.

Secondly, Sue certainly had her career plans. She was ambitious. But she didn't let her private agenda interfere with what was good for the business. She aligned her goals to those of the business.

Third. Sue investigated where she could be a significant player or as we say today \_ It adds value." Once she got a good handle on the business she explored what parts of the business she could help grow. Those parts were her little garden. And things certainly did blossom.

Fourth. Sue trusted all of us at Carlson. Maybe she didn't like everyone but she saw that we were people of worth. Therefore, she wasn't going around analyzing why Jake said that to Pat and why he didn't say anything to her. This lack of suspicion freed her up to do her best.

Five. Sue intuitively sensed when it was time to change. Maybe her image needed to be fine tuned. Maybe she needed a course in accounting. Perhaps she should learn about the mindset of the Russians. Therefore her growth was continuous and natural.

JORGE L. CARRO

Six, Sue believes in Sue. She is committed to the idea that we are all masters of ourself. She knows in her gut that its not what happens to us but how we handle it. As a result Sue doesn't live in fear of what could happen. She knows that she can deal with whatever is put on her plate.

And seventh, Sue approaches everything in her job with the end in mind. If she conducts a meeting she does it with an end in mind. Because she does that she saves people time. People see this as respect. They've been eager to help Sue succeed. Sue Gordon's experience, strength and smarts reflects that of dozens of women who have succeeded in Carlson.

Another is Sue Elliott - on your Board. Sue, will you please stand up. She is executive vice president of TGI Fridays. Sue has gone the extra mile as far as service people go. She recognized our business was going to expand around the world. She did training around the world to make it happen. She handled the travel, the tough and lonely nights, the insults and more.

She went to countries in all parts of the world and recognized that TGI Fridays needed to adapt to cultures far different from the one she knew best.

In Russia she made the decision to look for a hearing people. She took some down people and here is what happened.

629

Sue Elliott, Sue Gordon and all the women who get promoted are 100 percent focused.

They're not sidetracked by having a tough or a difficult boss. They ignore how incompetent the new hire is or why bonuses aren't bigger.

They don't invest their time in analyzing what's wrong with the organization.

And they accept the ground rules as they're spelled out. Therefore when they play the game they can give it their full attention.

They're not distracted.

Focus is everything.

Wow! live spoken a long time. In closing. I just want to read you something which really hit me when I came across it. This something Covey wrote - and from what I see Covey really understands women:

How different our lives are when we really know what is deeply important to us, and keeping that picture in mind. We manage ourselves each day to be and to do what really matters most?

UNQUOTE

Thanks for being a great audience. And now for your comments and questions.

Capital Punishment From A Global Perspective

THE DEATH PENALTY: RIGHT OR WRONG?

Address by JORGE L. CARRO, Prrylk'ssor nLaw, Emeritus, University of Cincinnati  
Delivered to the Fifteenth Annual Judicial Conference of the Twelfth Appellate District Court of Ohio,

Middlemwn, Ohio, April 29, 1996

conference where judges, practitioners and law professors get to work together for the betterment of the law. In doing so, we are going to deal today with death as punishment imposed by a tribunal, based on written law, even when the tribunal on its proceedings did not precisely follow due process. People kill people in foreign wars, in civil strifes and in terrorist acts. Although some human rights activists tally those casualties as part of the death penalty. We are of the opinion that its debate belongs to another forum, probably within the confines of the laws of war.

I do not pretend to be an expert on capital punishment. My qualifications on it are based on my personal experiences as an actor defending many capital punishment cases in my country of origin, Cuba, as well as on my twenty years of closely following its development as spectator, both here and there.

The debate on capital punishment can be traced as far back



as biblical times. There is a contradiction in the Bible between the Fifth Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," and the idea of retribution, (vengeance?) of an eye for an eye." You will find the same contradiction in other religious canons.

Historically, as a nation, in debating the use of the death penalty we have shifted our positions from imposition to abolition and vice-versa, in a reactive mood, according to the circumstances. However, we have never been able to reach a consensus.

I have great admiration and respect for this type of judicial But, after so much violence in America these days, the 1996 debate on capital punishment has been concentrated not on its abolition or imposition, but on how quickly, instead, the sentence to death should be executed. We are definitely, now, for it. Four of every five Americans, or 77 percent, favor the imposition of the death penalty for certain crimes. This position places us on a collision course with the rest of the members of the family of nations.

I am not going to reenact this afternoon the traditional pros and cons of the debate on capital punishment in America, nor am I going to side with one position or another. Clarence Darrow, a fierce, passionate crusader against death penalty, crudely said once: "It is a question of how you feel. That is all. If you love the thought of somebody being killed, why, you are for it. If you hate the thought of somebody being killed, you are against it." Putting it more mildly, you either favor the death penalty or you don't. This is a too distinguished, too-learned, too-experienced audience for me to try to persuade you to change imbedded convictions. What I would like to do, instead, is to tackle the issue today from a global perspective, from the point of view of international law, the law of nations, identified by organized bodies of countries duly constituted as a group, as well as from the point of view of comparative law; the study of the similarities and differences among the legal systems of the individual nations.

From the point of view of international law, there are several international and regional organizations that oppose the death penalty. Good examples are: Art. 3 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights ("Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person"); the 1950 Convention for the Protection of Human Rights of the Council of Europe ("The death penalty shall be abolished"); and the 1990 Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights (That the tendency among American states is to be in favor of the abolition of the death penalty). Although the United States has become part of these conventions, we have always made reservations regarding the abolition of the death penalty. This position has created some problems when dealing with extraditions. When we want to extradite our criminals who take refuge abroad, the countries who harbor them tend to deny our petitions for extradition when the crime they committed here carries the death penalty. From the point of view of comparative law, it is useful to know how other nations are dealing with capital punishment. According to statistics compiled by the human rights group Amnesty International, on June 30, 1995, 55 countries have abolished the capital punishment for all crimes, 15 countries have abolished the death penalty for all but exceptional crimes such as wartime crimes, and 27 countries have de facto abolished the death penalty. These countries retain the death penalty in their codes but they have not carried out any execution during the past ten years or more.

Furthermore, an average of two countries per year have abolished the death penalty since 1976, and 21 countries have abolished it since 1989. As you will notice, the trend in the international organizations as well as in individual countries is towards abolition. This trend places us in an awkward position. The United States is now the only Western industrialized country that retains the death penalty.

In spite of this, a small number of countries have accounted for the vast majority of executions. In 1994, 2,331 prisoners were executed: 1,791 in China; 139 in Iran; and over 100 in Nigeria.

Also, once capital punishment is abolished in a specific country, then it is seldom reinstated. It is also worth noticing that more than 100 countries have excluded anyone under 18 years old of the application of the death penalty.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the American Convention on Human Rights and the Convention on the Rights of the Child contain provisions to this effect. Unfortunately, four countries since 1990 are known to have executed convicts who were under the age of 18 at the time of the crime: Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and United States. We lead the group with six executions of juveniles since 1990. To try to compare our death penalty with that of several countries will make this presentation too cumbersome. Allow me, based on my personal experiences, to compare only two systems: the United States and Cuba.

As I said before, I practiced law in Cuba for seventeen years, and during the last eight years I practiced there, under a totalitarian regime. I defended 20 capital punishment cases. Since I came to the United States from Cuba in 1967, I have closely followed the evolution of capital punishment in both countries. My only intention today is to share with you what I have learned in the process.

First, let us talk about the United States. We already agreed that the current mood in this country is for capital punishment. Not only the statistics show this trend, but Hollywood, with its VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

accurate instinct for what is fashionable, has recently produced two movies on the subject, and a third one is coming soon. All this is the product of a strong reaction to the pervasive violence in our cities (Los Angeles, New York, Miami), in our small towns and even in rural America. Violence is rampant, from the traditionally safe environment of our schools, our churches and our working places, to the intimacy of our homes

as domestic violence has attained dramatic proportions. Perpetrators are of both sexes, of all races, of all ages. Juvenile delinquency for one is cause for alarm. Children are killing parents, children are killing children. Some people have predicted that because the children of today will become the adults of tomorrow, the degree of violence will be so brutal at the advent of the new century, that we might reminisce, nostalgically, about the current degree of violence, as the good old days.

According to a novel theory, the agglutinating factor, the cohesiveness in juvenile gangs is based on some sort of spiritualism, some sort of pseudo-religion or cult, that makes the group feel or believe, that their actions, are fatally pre-determined, producing a tremendous disregard for human lives, including their own.

This is not America! we say in desperation. So we blame this crisis on social and economic factors, on problems in the family nucleus, on the drug culture, on the relaxation of our moral and religious values. Then we move from the abstract to the concrete, and we become personal. We blame parents, teachers, and ministers of God: we blame government: we even blame judges.

Judge-bashing is becoming, popular these days. We recently witnessed how the inept president and the presumably presidential candidate of the opposition joined their voices on a brutal attack on a certain judge. According to a judicial tradition, judges, in order to preserve the appearance of impartiality, refuse to be forced to opine in public controversies. Can you picture these busy judges halting their business of imparting justice, and setting aside some of their precious time every day to defend themselves in the court of public opinion?

But, the judge-bashing is so widespread that some judges labeled the bashing of that particular judge as "an extraordinary intimidation." Even the Honorable Chief Justice of our United States Supreme Court, William H. Rehnquist, when in a recent speech, without mentioning names, stated that "judicial independence is one of the crown jewels of our system of government." the media interpreted his remarks as a condemnation of this incident.

The Cuban poet Jose Marti said once that "humanity is divided in two groups: those who love and build and those who hate and destroy." The great fabric of our society has been sided with the first group. Unfortunately, those counted in the second group are alarmingly growing. It is like we have been so diligent in our nihilism, in our negativism, in our destruction of our past beliefs, in the discredit of our religious and political leaders, of our government, of our police, even of our sports heroes, that we have neglected to find solutions or decent alternatives.

Facing this almost chaotic situation, we react, we look at the capital punishment as some sort of "snake oil" which cures every disease, as a panacea. This is not America! we say, and in going to the extremes in punishing crimes, we believe we might be able to rebuild the America we used to believe in. In doing so, we close the circle. We go back to the Bible and reenact the

JORGE L. CARRO

idea of llan eye for an eye." Our best response to violence is to create more violence.

As such, capital punishment is currently imposed in thirty-eight states (a vast majority), and two more states are considering its reinstatement. But, at the same time, the official taking of a human life is so repugnant to many. that our reluctance to execute has created a de facto abolition with the result of a national death row population of almost three thousand inmates awaiting execution \_ one hundred sixty-seven in Ohio alone. Not only that, but we also suffer from the post execution syndrome.

Even after the executions take place, we keep arguing forever on the innocence of the executed, like in the cases of Sacco and Vanzetti, the Rosenbergs, and the kidnapper and killer of the Lindberghls child. Bruno Hauptmann. All of them were executed decades ago, but we still debate on their guilt or innocence. I recently learned that a group of university professors whose mission is to find miscarriages of justice in execution cases have identified, they say. one hundred and twenty cases where the executed was innocent.

Ten years ago the United States Supreme Court declared capital punishment as constitutional, and through case law, have recently placed some restrictions on the availability of the use of the writ of habeas corpus, but still. in capital punishment cases many years are passing between the result of the trial and the execution. The excessive delays are placing a heavy burden not only on the convict, but also on the families of the perpetrator and on the families of the victims as well. The experience is so unbearable that a recent phenomenon has started to emerge. Convicts are disallowing their lawyers in their efforts to stay the executions. They are begging the courts to be executed, and the courts have no other alternative than to acquiesce to their desires. With all due respect. this is some sort of assisted suicide, Dr. Kavorkian style. by judicial decree. Only two days ago, a case of this nature took place in Virginia.

We have to agree that if we are reaching a consensus on the use of the death penalty, we have to improve its execution. if this is possible.

Only two days ago, President Clinton signed, after an overwhelming approval of Congress in a non-partisan effort, the 1996 Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act. It is intended, among other provisions, to stop the endless abuse of remedies used at the appellate level in death penalty cases. It establishes provisions for time limitations of one year between the end of the trial and the filing of the writ of habeas corpus. It also requires that before a federal judge hears the exceptional remedy, the Court of Appeals has to clear the way by the finding of probable cause. The decision of the Court of Appeals has to be based on very restrictive standards which the Act delineates.

Welcomed by many, it still faces a strong opposition. Civil libertarians has labeled it as the death of the habeas corpus. Soon this new law will be dissected, analyzed and challenged, in court, in the legal literature, and in the media. Will it survive? Will it bring efficiency and speed to the process? It is hard, and too early, to tell.

In establishing a parallel between the Cuban system and the American system we might find some similarities, yes indeed, as well as some dramatic differences. In the process we might learn some lessons on how ours may be improved.

Cuba has always recognized the use of capital punishment.

631

It has always been the Constitution. It applied to certain non-political crimes and to war crimes. A handful of inmates were executed from 1902 to 1958.

During Castro's revolution in the mountains, the guerrillas readopted a very brief, imperfect penal code that we applied during our war of Independence. which code established the death penalty for war crimes. When the revolutionary govern-

ment took power on January 1, 1959. the government considered that crimes of all types committed by members of the former government were acts of war. and as such. and in their reaction to the need to consolidate power. they executed hundreds of prisoners. Later on. when the first signs of opposition started to emerge, the government promulgated one of their first decrees which defined the extent of counter-revolutionary activities. and of course, capital punishment was applied for the first time to political crimes. On November 29, 1961. the law entitled Death Penalty Sanctions for Those who Carry Counter-revolutionary Acts. extended the application of the death penalty to a long list of political acts. It was a reaction to the Bay of Pigs invasion of April, 1961. Many executions followed. In the eighties, when organized opposition to the government diminished to almost non-existent. executions were reduced to about three or four per year. A new Penal Code enacted in 1973. extended the death penalty to all types of crimes, from counter-revolution and embezzlement, to sexual intercourse with girls under the age of twelve and homosexual assault with violence. This was a reaction to what the Cuban government considered the prevalent moral decay of the revolutionary people.

Similarities with our system? Both are reactive. Both are the product of reactions to local or international events. None of them were preceded by a cold, dispassionate scientific study on its deterrence. Allow me to be anecdotal.

When the Bay of Pigs invasion occurred, more than one hundred thousand citizens were placed in detention. in improvised prisons. Theaters, schools. stadia were habilitated as such. Many lawyers were subjected to this treatment. The special jurisdiction of the revolutionary tribunals was put to work. The revolutionary tribunals were located in an old military fortress, in the Bay of Havana, near the famous Morro Castle. In the compound, in a very convenient way, a pretrial prison for counter-revolutionary inmates. the revolutionary tribunals and the place of execution. called the wall (paredon) were accommodated. The so called wall was a dried moat, where executions could be heard by the prisoners. It was located on our way to the prison. Regular visitors, like the defense lawyers could see the morning after a long night of executions by firing squad, how birds were pecking fragments of human flesh of those executed the night before.

During those days of the invasion. I became acquainted with a mentally retarded young inmate in his early twenties who was charged with intention to commit arson. The police version was that he was captured with a small can of lighter fluid with the intention to set fire to a gas station. He was brought to trial the morning of the invasion. There were many capital punishment cases scheduled for that day. The atmosphere was tense. The trial was very brief: it lasted less than one hour. It consisted of the statement of the accused, who denied the charges, followed by the statement of a member of the political police, who briefly recited the facts. There was no corroboration, nor medical evaluation of the mental condition of the accused, nor any other evidence. We were not allowed to pro-

(IUC any. and we never knew ili the can oli lighter l'luitl. the only material evidenee. was full. hall' l'uull or empty. al the time 01 his detention. Alter a brief deliberation. the tribunal returned with a guilty verdict and recommended the imposition oli capital punishment hy tiring squad. An automatic appeal followed three hours later that same day. The sentence was eonliirmed. While I was walking to the exit gate. I clearly heard the commands to the liiring squad followed by the shots of six powerful rililes. and the "coup (IC graeef I never really knew ili the exeeutetl person was my elient or any other person. I was only convinced that 01 all the eases in which I was involved. this was the most unjustified ol all. It wasjust a case oli reaction in haste.

A great dill'renee between our system and Cuba's. is their dramatic speed. My last capital punishment trial there lasted only twelve hours. At 10:00 a.m.. tor the lirst time. I visited my client who was ineommunieado alter his detentionliortwoweeks. His trial was scheduled at 1 1:00 a.nr It was a typical one, with only one witness. He was found guilty and sentenced to death. Two hours later. were the appeal and the eonIiirmation. followed by the execution at 10.00 pan. The entire process. from visita-tion to execution lasted only twelve hours.

A I'ew months later. I came to this country and learned about the trial 01' a fellow named Caryl Chessmail who in 1948 was VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

convicted on seventeen counts of robbery, kidnapping, and attempted rape. He was finally executed on May 2, 1960, after a twelve year process that involved eight stays of execution. The contrast between the twelve hours of my last case and the twelve years of the Chessman case was for me a shocking experience.

With the new procedures in place, state judges will face a great responsibility in handling death penalty cases. You might think that my eomparison between the Cuban and the Ameri-can systems olijustice has been unfair. The United States judi-eiary will never be like thatt you mighl say. We have a very well established system of cheeks and balances to prevent that, you might also say.

We have to deal with violence in America, sternly and firmly, but we have to be cautious. sober and dispassionate to deal with the current mood in the country and with the new changes on the capital punishment process. In our efforts to accelerate the executions. we must not jeopardize our most precious trea-sure , our constitutional rights.

I used to term my dark days of practice in Cuba as lawyering without law. I solemnly place my faith this afternoon in the integrity of ourjudieiary. I wish that no American lawyer will have to lament one day: I am lawyering without the Constitu-tion. Thank you.

War Without End

THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS A FORGOTTEN WAR

Address by NORM BERTASAVAGE. 1711' ('lmirmun, Planning Commission. Brunch Township Delivered m (/18 L/mi'z'llyn Amvrit'un I'IUIUIYHIX Memorial Celebration, Llewellyn. Pennsylvania. May 27. 1996

hank you Commander IiarreIIt my fellow Veterans. Hon-ored Guest. ladies and gentlemen. I would like to begin this address by giving you a mathematical equation to take with you when you leave here today. That equation is 152 MC 3. No, that is not an error. the one that says EZMCZ is for geniuses. This one is for the rest 01 us.

In my address today. I want to pay tribute to the men and women who fought a forgotten war. Those who (lidnit survive that war are long forgotten. liven many oli their eomratles in arms have (Iililieulty remembering their names. Those who l'ought this war and lived are now "long in tooth." They go through lil'e little noted and less honored for their saeritiee than any group of Americans ever to take up arms at the request of their government. Yet saeriIiee they did.

It was a war older than most of you illl(1 yet still an ongoing war. It started. as so many of our recent eonl'lietst two years

after the Korean peninsula was divided by the United Nations into two nations. The communist government of the North looked at the civil unrest and corruption of the democratic government of the South and the time was ripe for reunification of the Korean Nation. The Korean war started in June of 1950. Just a few days over 5 years after the end of the Second World War.

The United Nations then as now debated on what to do. A decision for the use of Armed Forces was pushed forward and strongly urged on the UN by the President of the United States. This World Organization set up to preserve the peace then as now decided on a course of Action. By law it could not be a war. The United Nations had and has a mandate to prevent international wars and the use of foreign Armed Forces. So it was called a "Police Action."

At a time when the rest of the Nation and the world were enjoying a return to a normalcy put on hold over 10 years previous, young Americans again put down their tools and picked up their weapons. These citizen soldiers put off their enjoyment of the present and their plans for the future. Dave Fetterolf, Steve Rada, Bob Seiger, Donald Starr, Robert Miekshaw closed down coal mines, left jobs at the plant and plans for education because they believed that the leaders of our Nation had the right to send them off to war. Send them to join the thousands of other Americans leaving behind similar dreams to enter the nightmare of war without end.

To the thousands of American Soldiers who fought there, it was hard not to call it a war. Over 105,000 of those who served were wounded, which is a high number for a Police Action.

Over 54,000 were killed in action against an armed enemy but it was not a war. It was not a war but 7140 Americans were taken prisoner. Thirty eight per cent or 2701 of these prisoners died in captivity because the protection of the Geneva Convention was denied to them but to all those men, it seemed like a war. To the families of the over 8100 missing in action, it may seem like a war, but the United Nations said it was not. Sort of like today, the United Nations calls Bosnia a "peace keeping mission." only then it was a "police action." Our guys called it the Korean war.

Let me give you some facts about Korea. It is a peninsular

NORM BERTASAVAGE

nation of mountainous terrain. The population in 1951) was about 28 million people. 97 percent of who were Korean. The land area for both North and South Korea was about 85 thousand square miles. In comparison. Bosnia is roughly about 1/3 the size with a population about 1/6th the number of people. Korea is very cold in winter and can get rather warm in summer. Farm land is scarce as the mountains are high and yields little without a struggle. In 1950 it had little to offer the rest of the world and even less for the rest of the world to light over. But fight it did, and fight it does. War without end. The headlines from June 23, 1950 and May 27, 1996 of aggressive action by the government of North Korea against South Korea. A military dictatorship in the North still senses the same unrest and corruption in the South today as it did years ago and the dream of national reunification is still alive in both nations. Reunification as occurred in Germany and in Viet Nam. Reunification as is going on today in Bosnia. All opposed by the wishes of the United Nations and the United States. All with young Americans asked by their government to do the impossible. Today it is with the grandsons of the Dave Fetterols, Don Starrs. Bob Seiger and others who survived the Korean War, but without the Grandsons of Robert Mickshaw and so many others. because they did not survive Korea to have grandsons march off to war without end, A major cause for war without end is the constant struggle for national and international control between the thinkers and the thugs. In Korea, in Viet Nam. the Persian Gulf. Somalia and Bosnia, war is more often the struggle between thugs and thugs. In the distant past, our nation chose to let the thugs fight it out except when the fighting threatened international peace. Thinkers of the world then armed themselves and in many cases, the thugs among them, in an effort to halt the International Conflict. Today it seems that there are more thugs among the thinkers than thinkers among the thugs. The thinkers of the world have long struggled to devise legal means to stop and implemented international treaties to punish those who engage in war without end. These laws, like the Hague conventions of 1898 and 1907 outlined procedures under which war could be conducted. The Geneva convention codified the treatment of prisoners of war. The Briand-Kellogg treaty known as the 1928 Treaty of Paris outlawed international wars. The very charter of the United Nations prohibits the use of force in International affairs. President Clinton as a young man opposed the Viet Nam war as illegal. Yet in 1939 Hitler didn't believe the laws applied to him. In 1950, Kim Il Sung believed he had a right to use Force for Reunification. And in 1996 President Clinton and many others in America believe that the use of International Armed Force in the cause of peace is justification for ignoring international laws against war without end. As an American who believes in the Constitution and the duties and responsibilities given to all of us in that document, I have served my country. Only 13 years old when the Korean War started, I still applied to the Marine Corps and the Army Recruiters in Pottsville to let me join. I believed that the leaders of my country were right and that honorable people answered the call issued by their leaders. No Army or Air Force recruiter would believe my story that I just looked young for my age. Four years later, I did get into the Army and a career that let me see first hand the destructive nature of war fought by others and later. to see close up and personally, the horrors of war. All the while believing that the leaders of my nation

633

were a lot smarter than I and all honorable men and women. A condition that exist and allows the continuation of War without end. Which brings me to the equation I gave you at the beginning of this speech. The Constitution of the United States gave us a document for government which saved room for the thinkers. Thinkers to ponder the best allocation of our nations re-



sources.

Thinkers to determine the promotion of individual rights.

Thinkers to assign priority to national and international causes.

Thinkers who would delegate authority to many people to assure that those who were governed were able to feed, clothe and shelter themselves while making a contribution to that government so that freedom and democracy were protected. Thinkers to provide a system of justice and fairness to protect all from the thugs outside our nation, the thugs within our nation and the thug within ourselves.

It is necessary to have both the thinker and the thug because they are intertwined within all of us. The thinkers promote the use of tools which have given communities the ability to feed, clothe and shelter themselves. These tools give to a people surpluses that free up time, manpower and the resources to advance a civilization and to protect its citizens. These surpluses also give rise to idleness and the seeds of self destruction are then sown. When balance between the thinkers and the thugs has been struck, there has risen government where progress of all humanity has advanced. Where the balance has been tilted in favor of one side or the other, history has been witness to decay, desolation and war without end.

The equation I gave you is  $I = MC^3$ . It is an equation for effective government. The M stands for maturity because only people of maturity, no matter what their age, are needed for effective government. The three Cs stand for Concern, Commitment and Compassion.

Concern in the meaning of a matter or enterprise to which we as individuals devote our time and energy for our own development, satisfaction, and support. It need not and in fact should not be the same for everyone. It is that which we most enjoy doing, and are best at doing. It is the economic activity that allows us to make a contribution to our own welfare, the welfare of our community and the welfare of our nation.

Our commitment on the other hand is to making the concern we chose fit the needs of our community and the balance between the thinker and the thug within all of us. This commitment is to the world around us. A commitment to our natural environment, not as college degreed environmentalist telling others what needs to be done but as conservationist doing what is necessary to provide for clean air, water and a biological diversity to pass on to future generations. It is a commitment to our fellow human beings to conduct our affairs with regard for those within our environs those affected by our actions in carrying out our concern. Without this commitment, we leave ourselves exposed to ideas which may cloud our judgment and tilt the balance we have between the thinker within and the thug without.

The last C, compassion is what makes us human. It is the quality that makes us care about the rights and dignity of those around us. It is compassion that lifts us up from the ranks of base animals and thrust us into a stewardship of our world. It is the quality that makes us say others have rights to be respected, others have thoughts that should be given a hearing, others have concerns which merit our attention and above all, it is the

quality which allows us to consider the fact that we may be in the wrong. Compassion is that which prevents the thinker from becoming the thug. The ingredient of compassion is most vital in bringing about an end to War without end.

I offer this formula for you to use. Use it in choosing the leadership of our constitutional government. Every survey conducted by any of the groups polling Americans finds a dissatisfaction with government rampant among us. People are unhappy with their government and distrustful of authorities. Anti-Government sentiments supply recruits for all manner of activities which claim to be constitutionally protected free speech.

What so many of these groups fail to do is accept the responsibility for governing.

This responsibility is not the authority to tell others what to do. It is the responsibility to build roads to carry goods and people to markets where the services and products are needed. It is the need to fix potholes in those roads. Schools are built by those who take on the responsibility for education of our children. It is those who provide court houses to mediate the disputes among thinkers who supply those goods and services. It creates the law enforcement and military systems to protect lives and property from the thugs within and without. Calling for term limitation is not a solution to responsive government. Lord Acton reminded us that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. It is great to be a rebel and unhappy with the way things are. Without rebellious thought, there is not progress. But if you want to be a rebel or are asked to select a rebellious ideology make it one that brings new ideas to bear on the problems of government during the week. Then ride your Harvey Davidson on the weekend. If you chose to rebel and not contribute, keep in mind that those you allow to hold office may make a transition from thinker to thug. You then have contributed to war without end.

Because most people and most governments seldom are able to rise above the tribal level in providing government, let me also offer five areas for political action. Political concern because that is where the causes of War without end lie. The areas of concern I offer are these: Conduct of Foreign Affairs by the elected government, a plan for health care, a plan for crime prevention, a plan for financial equality, and a plan for transportation. The basic outline of these elements can be used to affect the way we choose our leadership at all levels of government.

We currently conduct our foreign affairs with a political arrogance and selective judicial usurpation that defies the wishes of the rest of the world. We need a policy change to conduct our foreign affairs at the federal level to achieve that balance between the thinkers and the thugs in international conduct. A foreign policy devoted to the peaceful interchange of goods and ideas. A foreign policy that leads by example, not force of arms. To achieve such a goal requires leaders with a highly developed degree of maturity and a devotion to the three C's. Health care is as vital to the military security of our nation as it is to the economic health of our society. A health care plan to provide access to medical services for all will strengthen our democracy and provide economic benefit to all society. It must, of necessity, be a plan that couples the participation of the individual citizen with a contribution from the community in promoting the health of individuals. A plan that guarantees every American is born in medical security, will have bumps and bruises, coughs and colds tended to throughout life, and

VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

be eased into death with dignity and grace. It would be a plan that requires each individual to protect his own health through nutrition, caution, temperance and control while pursuing their concerns and commitments.

Lack of an example and lack of respect for the law is a keystone of the prisons builders association. It matters little if the disregard is for international law demonstrated by Bill Clinton

and his officials or the disregard for local law by kids who trash King's Village Mall. The examples set and regard for international law and local statutes created by thinkers and protected by warriors over the years has fallen on evil times. I offer the peace time draft as a partial solution to our crime problem. The control of juvenile crime is the second most important domestic issue facing our nation. To halt the ever increasing rate of criminal activity we must first attack the issue of gang related crime. To do this will require a disruption of the leadership of gangs and a debasing of membership in gangs by our young. A peace-time draft is the biggest first step we can take along the road to solving the problem of crime.

Current thinking is to build more and more prisons for more and more criminals. Why not start back at the point where the criminals come from. We must first recognize that we are dealing with young people. Young people have an energy and an ebullience that needs guidance and direction. Young men especially overflow with these qualities. Trying to stifle this youthful energy requires the performance of an unnatural act. At a time in their life where our society asks our young to accept this unnatural condition, we provide nothing to absorb this energy.

These young men we brand as criminals are basically good kids passing through a time of life when they are unsure of themselves and the direction their lives will take. Unskilled and inexperienced, they are unable to secure the employment to channel and change that enormous energy. Teen centers and basketball courts open till midnight do nothing to dissipate that energy. We adults must accept that these young and their energies will not go away. Prisons are not a solution. A better solution would be to turn them over to the tender mercies of "old Sarge" in a military program to improve our Nation. It would give them a sense of self worth and direction, a time to sow some wild oats, and a respect for law. A respect based on recognition of their value and an example set by us.

The example of invasion by armed men into the territory of another nation is thuggery on a grand scale. It is no more acceptable in Bosnia than it was in Korea. Gangs of youths smashing into vehicles parked in a mall is also thuggery, on a less grand scale, but none the less acceptable. Our legal system has proven to be the greatest obstacle to justice at either level. One can hardly be blamed for distrust of a judicial system under which the powers of law enforcement are curtailed in protecting the citizens and the Supreme Court chooses to turn a deaf ear to the appeals of an ordinary citizen against the international crimes committed in his name by those who hold office. All causes of War without End.

Any plan for financial equity must begin with control of money. The issue of a rise in the minimum wage is one of diversion, not correction. The major beneficiary of this would be the taxing bodies. The ability to live on the minimum wage can best be measured by comparing the take-home portion against the increased cost of everything.

While it sounds good, this is a ploy to maintain the thugs in office rather than advancing the cause of the thinkers of how

SCOTT MCLAIN

we can best increase participation in the wealth created. It is a ploy because most of the employment left in the United States is in the service industry. How long will it take to see that if there is little wealth creation, there can be only less income creation and fewer and fewer who can afford service.

A second area of concern with financial equity lies in the concentration of more and more of the nation's money in the hands of fewer and fewer banks. The safety of the nation and the citizens is affected adversely by this concentration. In any activity, the further from home the control over the activity is, the greater the danger of the thinkers becoming thugs. Interstate banking is a concept so close to communism, I shutter thinking of it. Our Nation was built on banks who handled the wealth of the community in the distribution of access to wealth. Nothing like that is available today. We compete for funds with all sorts of demands in a system that sucks up the wealth in ostentatious behavior. Another War without end.

Lastly, I would challenge thought on the transportation

635

needed to keep our nation strong, our people healthy and our communications open. Most of what passes for transportation is based on the internal combustion engine. No one with any foresight can fail to see that the rate of usage of the oil, the fuel for the combustion engine will be depleted before many of the people here today are dead. Action to take steps to provide for replacement of the current transportation will provide jobs, create wealth and move the Nation forward. It will also challenge the world order in a way not seen since the middle ages. To not change may create the beginning of a new War without end. I would like to close today by reminding you once again of those Americans from our forgotten war. I would again remind you that they paid a terrible price for the freedoms we take so much for granted today. I would challenge you to remember my little equation of  $E=MC^3$ . It is not for geniuses. To remember this formula may not be the salvation of the planet. But it doesn't take a genius to see that it may help to halt the cycle of War without end. Thank you.

The Sale Of Two Countries

A REVIEW OF SALES AND MARKETING PRINCIPLES

Address by D. SCOTT MCLAIN, Real Estate Broker

Delivered to Sales and Marketing Executives, The Heritage Club, Huntsville, Alabama, May 20, 1996

at my own office. A difference is that I am at a podium, and you are an audience. We could just as easily be sitting around a conference table. While I will claim to be an expert of some sales and marketing principles. I know that you are experts as well. Therefore, I am preaching to the choir, and I humbly acknowledge it.

As I prepared for this presentation, I considered detailing my spin on sales and marketing, how I do it, and how I claim to be an expert. I thought I could conjure my top ten principles and review them with you. I have worked in sales and marketing, I will assert, since I started thinking a lot. in perhaps sixth grade, and I have read at least fifty books on the topic. Although this may not make me an expert, I will claim a good deal of study and practice.

Then I recognized that each of you would claim a similar expertise, and that each of you has read numerous books as well. I decided to review some of the principles I respect nonetheless, but within the framework of a recent experience that was quite interesting to me, and that I hope will be interesting to you. I figured that I could tell you of my experiences, and confirm my position, at the same time. that all we do. all any of us do, is sales and marketing.

I thought further that to convey these thoughts. I would tell a story, spin a yarn. and paint you a picture of an experience, with footnotes amplifying sales and marketing principles. So, and you will notice that this yarn is definitely autobiographical, though it is presented in the third person, we begin. The story is about a fellow, still a young man, at least by his

standards, who is a perpetual student of sales and marketing  
Thank you. Being here is like being in an office meeting,  
techniques and philosophies.

As I noted, this young man, graced by parents of perspective, figured out at an early age that everything in the world is sales and marketing. Sales and marketing is not simply selling widgets to companies. but is also asking for a date, rearing a child, advocating a position, and creating a personal philosophy. (Principle One: Sales and Marketing does not require a product or service to sell, but only a life to live.)

Our young man studied and practiced these precepts through high school, college, and did not even lose sight of them during three years of law school, like most of his peers. The fellow became a young lawyer and engaged in making a living. still applying these principles. (Principle Two: Not just "sales-people" are engaged in sales and marketing: everybody is. (Lawyers are just starting to figure this out.)

With this attitude, however, the fellow saw that the law business. at that time. was not so fertile a field for the marketing-oriented entrepreneur, except in the plaintiff trial practice, with which he had, and still holds. some philosophical differences. Therefore. he left his brothers of the bar and joined his father in commercial real estate, clearly. a sales and marketing haven, and where such skills are a daily necessity for survival. In an effort to establish his business. he not only worked hard on real estate matters. but also developed a hefty volunteer and civic load. (Principle Three: Visibility. credibility and reputation. for business, can be easily developed in volunteer and civic arenas.)

This load included the Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Action Committee. and then working with the City to establish the Downtown Master Plan, recently discussed in the

newspaper. This process was a grass roots, broad effort, and involved many folks, including some Alabama A & M University professors.

Almost ten years later, one of the professors called the young man, Alabama A & M. It seems, he had earned a grant to receive about thirty middle and upper level managers for the governments of Kazakhstan and Kryghyzstan for thirty days of training. The training would include commercial real estate, real estate financing, and other real estate topics. The young man was asked to handle this portion of the instruction. The training took place in November, 1995, and you may have read about the visit in the news. To instruct, the young man had to first learn what the participants knew, and what they needed. (Principle Four: Clearly understanding the knowledge base, needs, and goals of one's customer is the first, and a very important step before offering any information, service, or product.)

Then, armed with this understanding, the young man prepared remarks and lectures. (Principle Five: Once you know what your customer knows and what he or she needs, you can then appropriately prepare your presentation, and best empower it for success.)

Then the lectures and discussions occurred, and the young man offered his words and fielded the varied, and multiple, questions of this information-starved group. (Principle Six: An excellent presentation, implementing all the skills and techniques we all have studied, and addressing the specific needs of the customer, is required for a successful sale.)

Then, our fellow wrote thank you notes, delivered other requested materials, and told the professors that he would like to be involved in other such programs. (Principle Seven: A sale is not complete until one follows up, makes sure that the customer has everything he or she might need or want, and asks for the order.)

In 1996, asking for the order, and all the other efforts, paid off, and the young man, and one professor, went to Kazakhstan to continue the training for a week. This was a major pay-back for volunteer work, since the trip was all expense paid, and featured an honorarium, as well as several invitations to do business in the country.

How did our young man fare on this venture? His words are, "I was treated like a head-of-state, honored like a dead war hero, and entertained like troops in a battle everybody loves."

Why? Sales and marketing

As a geography and history lesson, Kazakhstan is one of the former Russian states, and is now part of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). It is located, generally, north of India, and west of China. Kryghyzstan is located just below Kazakhstan. Both are developing countries, with the implementation of private property and capitalism in full swing. The program was held in Almaty, the current capital of Kazakhstan. Almaty is a modern city with office buildings, new, nice hotels, mass transit, impressive museums, and other trappings of a large city. Capitalism, as noted, and the free market economy are developing rapidly, but evolutionarily. This development is a process. These people have suffered seventy years of oppression, dim hopes, and no options. Now they have many, and most options.

Many street vendors engage in sales and marketing in a way that is inoffensive and almost passive, and therefore pleasant, though less successful than the efforts of similar vendors in other parts of the world who "market" with boldness.

VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

Also, a Mafia has developed in the vacuum of this new economy, peopled by those who will take fullest advantage of capitalism and freedom, exceeding the limits of fairness. This condition, however, is neither surprising, nor out of step. Recall the robber barons, slave owners, sweatshop bosses, and our own Mafiosi of earlier days in our economy. Kazakhstan, as is Russia in general, is simply working its way up the ladder of

progression.

People in Kazaekstan are trying hard, and still have hard lives. Inflation is rampant, interest rates are over fifty percent (50 percent) per annum, and products and services are limited. This condition is Changing rapidly, though, as entrepreneurs test their wings, and as worldly visitors see and execute on opportunities in the country.

The people, though, are much like us. Their ethics, morals, values. and attitudes, once you get to know the people, are so similar to ours that the distinctions are boring. As the pop-singer Sting says in his song. ltRussian parents love their children too."

The young man had dinner at the home of an entrepreneur, who would be eligible for membership in this organization, a computer salesman. Igor had the nicest apartment of the three the young man visited, and the most modern toys, including two nice, non-Russian cars.

Igor was frustrated, despite being successful, though. He fought the bureaucracy, the lack of money in the country. and the prejudice against his Italian computer line. He knew and practiced, though. many of the sales and marketing techniques and philosophies discussed today. He said to the young man, through an interpreter, llYou know. you and I are really a lot alike. I have been taught all my life that you are the bad guy, and you are just fine. We think alike."

So. how did the sales and marketing techniques and philosophies of this young man. and understood and perhaps embraced by you. the members of this group, fare in Kazackstan? Quite well. Folks are folks. Sincerity requires no translation, and insincerity is no less offensive when translated than when offered in ones own forked tongue.

So. to conclude this soliloquy, I offer this review, with emphasis on my philosophy of sales and marketing. The philosophy is simple.

- ' Be honestly sincere.

- ' Insist on knowing the needs and knowledge base of your customer before offering any information. product, or servtee.

- ' Make sure the customer knows that you clearly understand his or her needs and goals.

- 0 Carefully evaluate your inventory and pick several of the products or services that best fit the customers needs.

- Review several alternatives with the customer and show how each either meets or fails to meet the customers needs. emphasizing features and benefits.

- ' Ask for feedback: probe for problems with questions.

- ' Follow up diligently.

- ' Ask for the order; close the sale.

- ' Always express gratitude and give best wishes for the future.

What works in other countries?

- ' Generally the same, sincere approach.

What is a great source of business?

- ' Community service, politics, and volunteer work.

These efforts are also necessary to preserving and to improv-

PETE DU PONT

ing the quality of life of where you live.

When do the payoffs of your hard work come?

0 Later, maybe much later. Press on, though, and know that your seeds will bear fruit.

What should be your attitude towards your peers?

' As a general approach. offer respect, recalling that there are more deals and more money than any one person can ever make.

' Teach and share when appropriate, when asked, or when needed, and remember that in so sharing, you are not rendering yourself vulnerable to increased competition, but rather you are preparing yourself to receive and to develop more talents and techniques to use and to share.

' Remember, too, that money is a commodity, and that keeping it flowing will keep it coming to you.

What is the future of Kazaekstan?

0 The country is coming right along.

' These are intelligent, sincere people, much like us.

0 They currently enjoy / suffer ajuvenile sales and marketing and free market economy.

0 They need and want our help. I read in Sky magazine

637

on an airplane recently that there are two reasons to do business in Russia; one, to have fun, and two, to make lots of money. Helping these people and these countries move into the global economy can be mutually rewarding.

What is a good attitude for all of us?

' Think big, think globally. and remember the basics of sales and marketing that affect not only our incomes and livelihoods, but also our personal success.

I will end with the first line of the book. the title of which I endeavored to pun upon in the title of this presentation. A Tale of Two Cities. The line acknowledges the opposites of life. as Kahill Gibran amplified in The Prophet: Oh was the best of times. it was the worst of times."

In sales and marketing endeavors, we have some control of our destiny and success. Sometimes it is "the best of times," and sometimes it is lithe worst of times." With that control, though, and if we constantly bear in mind, practieet real'l'irm, and implement the principles discussed today, and many others, we can ensure that it is more often tithe best of times."

I wish you all the best oli luck in your endeavors. and may you enjoy, as much as possible. "the best of times." Thank you.

Privatizing Social Security

IT CAN WORK: THE CHILE EXPERIENCE

Address by PETE du PONT, F ()rch Governor ()fDelaware, Polity Chairman, National C ()iilc 'ljfor P()/I(' \_V Analysis

Delivered as Testimony be "are the Sulutommitree On Soda! Security and F (Imily Polity (g ftho U .3. Senate Finanw

Committee, Washington, DC, May 20, 1996

Imost 10 years ago, I proposed what I called the Financial Security Program to give Americans an option of saving for their own retirement while maintaining the Social Security program, guaranteeing Social Security benefits for those already retired or nearing retirement and without ina creasing payroll taxes. At the time, I said, tlFor the past 15 years, Social Security has been the topic of a political discussion almost totally counterproductive. We have held strenuous political debates about making changes at the margins of this programfi

Now, 10 years later, the same speech unfortunately is appropriate if we simply change the first phrase to read, bFor the past 25 years The main change over the past decade is that the issue of what to do about Social Security has become a critical one, one that we are not going to be able to finesse much longer.

Our Social Security system \_ like the systems in most other countries \_ is on a pay-as-you-go basis. That is, taxes paid by today,s workers are not saved and invested to finance their future retirement benefits. Instead, most of the money is paid out



immediately in benefits for current retirees. Two world-wide demographic trends are going to make the pay-as-you-go approach untenable in the not too distant future. People are living longer and fertility rates are declining. Slightly more than 5 percent of the U. S. population was over 65 years old in 1960; today the percentage is nearly 13 \_ and by the year 2020 it is projected to be over 16 percent. The same trend is evident almost everywhere except in parts of the former Soviet Union. We need a fertility rate of about 2.1 lifetime births per woman to maintain a stable population. In the United States, the rate has declined from 3.45 in the early 1950s to 1.92 in the late 1980s. The only developed country in the world today with a fertility rate at 2.1 or higher is Ireland, and no others are projected to rise that high through the year 2020.

All of this means, of course, that the number of workers paying taxes to support retirees is shrinking quickly everywhere. In the United States, we had 16 workers for each retiree in 1950. Today it is 3.3 to 1 and by 2030 will be less than 2 to 1. At present, taxes paid into the Social Security system exceed benefits paid out, and the surplus goes for a few hours into a trust fund. Then it goes right back out again in loans to the federal government, which uses the money to make the annual deficit appear lower than it really is. In return for the loans, the federal government issues special bonds to the trust fund. So what we have in the trust fund is IOUs. When benefits paid out begin exceeding taxes paid in sometime a few years from now, the trust fund must be tapped, the IOUs will be called, and the money to pay off the special bonds will have to come from taxpayers. This will mean additional taxes on top of existing payroll taxes.

Obviously we have a problem that will become more severe the longer we wait to deal with it. Basically we have three choices:

1. We can let things go on as they are until in about 25 years (or sooner) the combined burden of Social Security taxes and other taxes will be so high that there will be an employee revolt against such onerous taxation and it will be difficult or impossible to effect any kind of solution.
2. We can try to tweak the pay-as-you-go system at the margins again, enough to keep it staggering along, by raising the

retirement age, reducing benefits and the like. Or,

3. We can convert Social Security to a fully funded system where each worker saves for his or her own retirement and the savings generate additional economic growth. Clearly the third choice, to allow each worker to provide for himself or herself, is the choice we ought to make. The Financial Security Program I proposed in 1986 continues to be a viable approach, but there is a working model Social Security reform not unlike the Financial Security Program, incidentally that I want to dwell on today.

The working model is Chile, the first nation in the Western Hemisphere to adopt a social security system — and the first nation in the world to replace its system. Chile converted to a system of individual pension savings accounts, but it gave workers participating in the old system a Choice of staying there or switching to the new system, and it ensured that pensions remained secure for those already retired. The change has resulted in both higher retirement benefits and greater economic growth for the country. Chile's reform is serving as the model for reform in several other countries, including Argentina, Bolivia, Colombia and Peru — and Mexico is preparing to move to a similar system. It behooves us to examine it as well.

#### Privatization in Chile

Chile reformed its social security system in 1981 because it had little choice. The system was a mess. The payroll tax for employees and employers combined was well over 20 percent of wages. but 28 percent of benefits were still being paid for out of general revenues. There was widespread evasion of payroll taxes, political favoritism in the payment of benefits, bad management of funds and a decimation of the value of benefits because of rampant inflation.

The reform was carried out under the Pinochet dictatorship, but the new system of individual pension savings accounts has remained popular as Chile has become a democracy. Employees participating in the old system when it was reformed in 1981 could stay with the old system or could switch to the private system anytime before 1986. Ninety percent chose the new private system. People entering the labor market after 1981 were required to participate in the private system.

How the Reformed System Works. Under the reformed system, each employee is required to contribute 10 percent of wages to an individual pension savings account, and can contribute up to another 10 percent, all tax deductible. The government has authorized 21 private investment companies called AFPs — Administradoras de Fondos de Pensiones to administer and invest the funds. Workers have to have their accounts with one of the 21 companies, but can switch accounts up to four times a year. so the AFPs are competitive. Three times a year, each worker gets a statement of the value of his or her individual account. The AFPs are managed by private financial professionals, and by law must follow conservative, prudent and diversified investment rules and avoid political influence or personal favoritism. The government guarantees a minimum rate of return which is set as the average of the return earned by all 21 companies. The government guarantees this minimum return. The government also guarantees a minimum pension benefit to all workers, and supplements the private benefits as necessary from general revenues to reach the minimum.

In addition to the pension contribution, employees must contribute additional amounts to the AFP to buy private life and disability insurance and to cover administrative costs. The VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

amount varies among AFPs, but averages about 1.5 percent of wages for the insurance and 1 to 2 percent for administrative costs. The government also guarantees minimum disability and survivors benefits.

One of the criticisms of the Chilean system in its early years was that administrative costs were too high, in some cases exceeding 14 percent of total assets. However, as competition

has grown among the funds the administrative costs have fallen to 2 percent or less.

Contributions and Benefits Altogether, employees are required to pay about 13 percent of wages into the new system. (And, as mentioned earlier, they can contribute another 10 percent if they choose.) Individuals and their employers together paid 22 percent of wages into the old system. Employers don't pay payroll taxes under the new system. To make sure that this reduction in payroll taxes was passed on to employees immediately, employers were required to give all an 18 percent wage increase when the new system went into effect. The net result was that employees who chose the private system paid about 40 percent less in payroll taxes than they had under the old system.

How much an individual gets in retirement depends on the rate of return earned by the private accounts, but generally, retirement benefits have been anywhere from 50 to 70 percent higher under the new system, disability benefits at least twice as high and survivors' benefits at least 50 percent higher.

The normal retirement age is 65 for men and 60 for women.

Retirees can buy an annuity with an insurance company, or they can leave the money with the AFP and make a scheduled series of periodic withdrawals. About two-thirds of the retirees have chosen the life annuity. People who have contributed more than 10 percent of their incomes can either receive a larger annuity payment or can retire early. Retirees pay taxes on what they receive, but usually at a lower rate than they would have paid while working.

Making the Transition. People remaining in the old system are guaranteed a minimum retirement benefit, which is paid out of general revenues. Since employers no longer pay the payroll tax, these employees have had to pay the full amount of the tax themselves, but they have had about the same take-home pay as before because of the required 18 percent wage increase.

Since Chile guaranteed that no retiree would suffer from the reform, the government committed to pay pensions to those already retired and those retiring later was about 3 percent of the country's gross national product. The U.S. Social Security system currently spends 4.6 percent of GDP on all Social Security payments. Chile financed its transition by selling government assets — primarily state-owned enterprises — and was able to do so without causing a deficit or raising tax rates and without causing increased inflation or higher interest rates.

Economic Impact. Not only has the private pension system paid larger benefits to participants, but it also has helped to fuel economic growth in Chile. People have developed substantial ownership of the private business sector through investments by their AFPs. The pension funds now total more than \$25 billion, which is about half Chile's gross domestic product. The net worth of the average Chilean today is about four times his or her average annual salary. By comparison, the net worth of the average American is about equal the average annual salary. Thanks to the private pension system, Chile has increased its savings rate to 26 percent of GNP. Its real

ALAN SCHRIESHEIM

economic growth rate has averaged more than 6 percent during the past 10 years.

Lessons for the United States

We in the United States do not have to remain tied to a system that clearly is dragging the nation toward economic and social catastrophe. Chile has demonstrated by example that a pay-as-you-go social security system can be transformed into a private system, and in the process, a nation's economy can be strengthened and the social welfare of its citizens improved and made more stable.

Almost 40 percent of our Social Security benefits in the United States are payments to widows children and the disabled. Until a private system is in effect long enough to provide these benefits through insurance — as in Chile — or through

639 some other means, these benefits could be financed by retaining a portion of the payroll tax. As in Chile, government could remain the provider of last resort, guaranteeing minimum benefits.

We already have a multi-trillion dollar commitment to pay benefits to those who are retired, who are nearing retirement or who have paid into the current system. We can honor that commitment through a general fund commitment.

Just as it was a decade ago, the need for reform is urgent. But it is more urgent than it was 10 years ago. And we cannot wait another 10 years. Even if we could, what is the sense of doing so when the current system is dragging down economic growth, harming workers financially and creating fears among retirees and workers alike about whether the system will even survive?

Obstacles To The 21st Century Technology

WILL WE RISE TO THE CHALLENGE?

Address by ALAN SCHRIESHEIM, Director, Argonne National Laboratory  
Delivered at the Midwest Regulatory Commission, Chicago, Illinois, July 17, 1988

the history of humanity is inexorably linked to scientific advances, each one built upon the advances of the past, like the levels of a pyramid, with each new discovery spurring a new round of societal growth. Just in our lifetimes, we have seen many scientific and technological marvels become commonplace — from penicillin and polio vaccine to jet aircraft, cellular phones, and the desktop computer. Such developments have enhanced both the length and the quality of our lives.

Those advances are the foundation for what lies ahead, an era that promises scientific breakthroughs of unparalleled magnitude.

In not too many years, we will see cures for some of humanity's most pernicious diseases; communications on a scale and at a speed almost beyond imagination; a new generation of tough, versatile materials; and smart, smooth transportation systems, including intelligent ears that tell you how to get where you want to go.

As we continue to advance toward that 21st Century & now fewer than 1300 days away — we scientists are well aware that major research progress always poses two significant challenges: The first is the unknown itself; the second is fear of the unknown. And it is the second that usually proves to be the greater obstacle.

Scientists need intelligence, training, and skill to conquer the unknown. And society needs courage to overcome fear of the unknown.

Today, many of our citizens get their science and technology information from actors and actresses, they read the astrological tables for advice, and they may believe in creationism. Today, there are those who fear advances such as nuclear power, which could lead to a sustainable, inexhaustible supply of energy — and who fear experimentation to unlock the code of life, the human genome, a project that could result in cures for humanity's most terrible diseases.

Several weeks ago, the National Science Foundation released

the results of a statistically valid survey conducted by John Miller of the Chicago Academy of Sciences. The survey assessed Americans' scientific literacy. Perhaps you saw a summary of the results. They were both troubling and consistent with past polls.

Some 73 percent of the 2,000 people surveyed failed a simple 10-question exam on basic science. Fewer than half understood that the earth orbits the sun; fewer than half knew that humans and dinosaurs never lived at the same time; fewer than half knew that electrons are subatomic particles. Only 1 percent could define a molecule, and only 21 percent could explain DNA. Only 10 percent feel very well informed about science and technology.

While 90 percent of college graduates in the poll thought the benefits of research outweighed the risks, just 48 percent of those who had not completed high school felt the same way. It is perhaps useful at this point to note that in our democracy the vote of a college graduate and the vote of a high-school dropout are exactly equal in weight.

The survey also found that, even among those who support scientific research generally, many are fearful of some aspects of science. Support for nuclear power was about evenly split, with 43 percent saying its benefits were greater than its risks, and 42 percent taking the opposite view. The rest were uncertain. Actually, that is somewhat better than I had expected: I had believed the magnitude of misinformation about nuclear power was far higher.

Genetic research fared only slightly better than nuclear energy. Forty-three percent saw it as beneficial, but 35 percent said its dangers outweigh the benefits. About 20 percent were undecided.

Perhaps understandably, medical discoveries were rated as the most interesting, of science topics by 69 percent of those who took the survey. Space exploration scored lowest on the interest question, just 25 percent.

In the face of such attitudes, our vital challenge is to educate ourselves and the general public to understand the rewards that science produces today, and the promise that science holds for tomorrow.

In that regard, there is a bright spot in the National Science

Foundation survey \_ one that holds much opportunity, ill scientists and scientifically literate Americans will only seize it. The survey found that the public holds science and medical professionals in higher esteem than most other professions. About 40 percent expressed high confidence in scientists and medical workers. The rating was only 25 percent for leaders of education. religion. or business \_ and 10 percent or lower for Congress. the federal executive branch. the news media, or organized labor.

This means we who practice or support scientific research are more likely to be believed ; if we talk with the general public. and do so in language they understand. Unfortunately those are two things we historically do not do well. We had better improve. because the alternative is not attractive. That bright future we so much enjoy discussing, that future lull of technological advances. requires two things: One is continued scientific research: the other is energy. And both are national or multi-national issues. demanding governmental and public support.

Unfortunately. while energy demand continues to rise, our energy options are rapidly and artificially being foreclosed. And nowhere is this more true than in the United States.

A new study by the US. Department of Energy's Energy Information Administration estimates that worldwide oil consumption will rise 44 percent over the next two decades. The study anticipates that world oil supplies will be able to meet this growing demand, although there will be increases in cost and increases in carbon emissions because of the greater use. Looking even farther into the future, the United Nations projects that the world population will double and energy demand will quadruple by 2050. The French Academy of Sciences is more pessimistic. forecasting that energy production must increase between five and ten times over the next 50 years! They say that is especially true if we are to meet the soaring energy demands of developing nations without jeopardizing the living standards of others.

Attention getting as those numbers are, history supports that magnitude of projection. Since 1900, world economic activity has increased by a factor of 20. industrial production by a factor of 50. and the consumption of fossil fuels by a factor of 30. That record makes the French forecast far less astonishing.

So how will we meet tomorrow's energy needs?

Of all our fuel choices to generate energy, we have three that everyone agrees would meet national energy demands and last for hundreds or thousands of years \_ coal. nuclear fission, and nuclear fusion.

#### VITAL SPEECHES OF THE DAY

Practical energy production by nuclear fusion has not yet been achieved, and even its strongest advocates say that won't happen until 2050 at the earliest. The US. research budget for fusion energy has been reduced.

Coal is widely perceived to be a "dirty" fuel, an environmental liability. Few people discuss "coal" and the "future" in the same sentence anymore.

Nuclear fission frightens people in this country, thanks in part to misinformation and scare tactics on a massive scale. Even though much of the rest of the world is building nuclear-fission power plants, the United States is not.

My laboratory. Argonne, developed and tested an inherently safe nuclear reactor \_ one that emits no air pollution, produces little waste. consumes waste from other nuclear plants, and shuts itself down if anything goes wrong. Washington shut it down permanently two years ago.

And what of the non-fossil, so-called "renewable" energy sources that so capture the imagination of the news media? Solar energy is an uncertain and capital-intensive source. "off " half the time and subject to weather vagaries at other times. Geothermal energy is limited by geography \_ as is hydroelectric, a source that also sparks environmental protests. These and

similar energy sources certainly have a role to play and should be pursued, but they cannot meet even today's demand, let alone tomorrow's.

Most Americans do not know that coal and nuclear fission together meet more than 70 percent of America's electricity needs today. They do not know this because we who do know it aren't telling them. Instead we continue to sip our own whiskey \_ by which I mean to just talk among ourselves \_ and wonder why the public doesn't understand.

Yesterday's energy supply cannot feed, clothe, and house tomorrow's population.

Yesterday's energy supply cannot fuel tomorrow's technological advances.

If we want that bright technological future tomorrow, we must address energy today. And we must address it with a more scientifically literate public who will grasp the situation, appreciate the options, and join in supporting logical long-term decisions.

I am optimistic. I believe we can do that, and I believe we will. Humanity has always risen to the challenge, quite often with a previously unforeseen technological leap. I have every reason to believe humanity will do so again.

And I sincerely trust that you, like me, look to the world of the future with hope, with optimism, and above all without fear. Thank you.