

THE NEXT TEN YEARS

By

Samuel L. Blumenfeld

It was just about ten years ago that this writer left the liberal democratic fold and became a conservative Republican -- or, to be more accurate, a libertarian Republican. The year was 1959, and the country was asked to choose between Richard M. Nixon and John F. Kennedy. Two things troubled me deeply about Kennedy and the Democratic party. The first was that Kennedy had openly advocated, in a controversial Senate speech, that France give up French Algeria to the Arab nationalists. I was dismayed at this position for many reasons: Algeria was a NATO territory; it had a large European and Jewish population; its oil resources could free France from dependence on Arab-controlled oil; French Algeria was, geo-politically, an important counterweight to Arab nationalism, and thus an important physical ally of Israel. It also kept France on Israel's side. Its loss to Arab nationalism would spell doom for Algeria's Jews, end the Franco-Israeli alliance, permit the Reds to outflank NATO, force France into an even greater dependency on Arab oil, and complete the Arab encirclement of Israel from one end of the Mediterranean to the other.

This was enough to turn me against John F. Kennedy, but the Democratic party also disturbed me. The Democrats had a propensity for getting us into wars, and I was afraid that another Democratic administration would get us into another war. We had had World War I under Wilson, World War II under

Roosevelt, the Korean War under Truman -- and judging from past Democratic performance the chance of another war seemed by no means impossible.

And so I voted for Nixon, who lost by a very small margin. Some people still believe that had a recount been ordered then, Nixon would have come out the winner. But that is pure speculation. There was no recount, and America's fate was once more placed in the hands of the nation's most irresponsible politicians, the liberal Democrats. Would we have had the tragedy of Algeria, the Berlin Wall, the Bay of Pigs, the United Nations war on Katanga, and our deep military involvement in Vietnam had Nixon been elected? No one can say for sure. But certainly much of the political tragedy of the last ten years can be placed at the doorstep of the Democrats. Were it not for the spectacular economic advances of the United States and the rest of the Western world during that period, there would have been nothing to redeem those ten years.

While one might argue that the turbulence and instability of the world contributed to the economic advances made by the Western countries, I am inclined to believe that these advances were made in spite of the turmoil. It is true that if one studied the economic and political situation in Africa -- from oil rich ^CAlgeria to copper rich Katanga to gold and diamond rich South Africa -- one could detect a correlation between economic and political forces at work in the struggle for power, but the expansion of the free-world's economy was still due more to market forces than to political forces alone. The technology explosion was also a significant factor, but technology was also greatly spurred by market competition.

But it took the Democrats to even spoil our economic gains by bringing

on the near runaway inflation which resulted from our ill-advised military involvement in Vietnam.

We survived those ten years with not much money in the bank to show for them. But we survived. Others did not do as well. Forty thousand young Americans were sacrificed in Vietnam in a war we should have never gotten into. Over a million Europeans, Jews and Moslems lost their land, their homes, their businesses in Algeria. Many others lost their lives. Katanga, a new nation which arose to shut out Lumumba's chaos, was destroyed by the United Nations "peace" forces. The Berlin wall was erected, in violation of the Potsdam agreement, and millions of human beings lost their chance to reach freedom. And in Cuba, Castro's Communist regime was permitted to enslave millions of Cubans; while the United States agreed to a hands-off policy to appease Khrushchev.

If we survived, it was in spite of the Democrats, not because of them. Democrats, of course, will complain that all of the nation's tragedies and troubles were not due to their leadership, that such tragedies cannot be attributed to the politics of a political party. There were hurricanes, automobile accidents, fires, and epidemics which took their toll -- and these tragedies take place whether the leadership in Washington is Republican or Democrat. But the danger to life and limb from man-made causes is always increased when Democrats are in power. This is because they create a climate of danger by the very careless, demagogic, schizophrenic way they exercise power.

In any case, in November 1968, after ten years of monumental Democratic

mismanagement, the American people put Richard M. Nixon, the man who might have saved them a good deal of trouble, in the White House.

In power only a year, the Nixon administration is just beginning to make a dent in the problems inherited from the Democrats, and we stand on the threshold of the Seventies with the knowledge that the patient is on the road to recovery, even though the cure is somewhat painful.

We wonder what it will be like in 1980 when we look back over the Seventies. Will we look at them with a sense of joy and fulfillment? Or a sense of relief.

Even though this writer mistrusted the Democrats in 1958 and knew that Democrats had a predilection for getting us into war, he only half-believed that they would actually do so. It was hard to imagine what kind of a war they could get us into. But wouldn't you just know that they would get us into the most hopeless, frustrating, costly, unnecessary, divisive war in our history. Only liberal Democrats could do that.

The Seventies can be happier years than the Sixties. But then there are ~~so~~ many question marks. Some things are easy to predict -- like an increased gross national product, supersonic jets, more interstate roads, and a richer Japan.

The best way to view our future prospects is to first project a picture of what we would like to have in the Seventies and then mull over what we must do to achieve what we want. Without question the vast majority of Americans want peace, continued economic growth, less taxes, and more personal freedom. They also want less crime and an end to riots. Will they get them?

If the present organization of our quasi-capitalist system is permitted to continue, then we can expect the economy to grow considerably during the next ten years. We are on the threshold of many technological breakthroughs which can enrich our lives in many ways. Assuming that inflation is brought under control, we should all be richer by 1980, live better, breathe cleaner air, and be able to travel anywhere with ease. Urban poverty will be well on its way to extinction.

As today's have nots become haves, the reason for riots and civil disturbances will diminish. Racism will not disappear, but the races will grow weary of battling one another and devote their energies to more productive pursuits. On the social mores front, there will be a greater acceptance of diverse minority behavior by the majority. A variety of life-styles will be acceptable as our concept of the norm undergoes some radical changes. The spirit of individualism will be reinforced by this trend and with it the need for greater personal freedom.

Federal taxes will probably remain at the present level well into the Seventies, but state and local taxes will continue to rise to pay for bigger schools, transit systems, and welfare. There will be attempts at new forms of organization to lower the costs of these services.

Crime will probably remain at the same level, simply because we haven't begun to understand criminality and how to control it. We shall have to live with a high rate of crime for many years to come.

Peace -- the most important concern of all. Will we have it? With the end of the hot war in Vietnam, the United States will still have to maintain

its leadership position as guardian of the free world for ^{the foreseeable future} ~~many years to come~~.

The Soviet Union's brutal action against Czechoslovakia ~~merely~~ means that we shall have to deal with hard-line Communists for ^{at least the next ten years.} ~~the indefinite future~~. Which means that regardless of what is agreed to by way of arms limitations with the Soviet Union, we shall have to maintain an expensive military establishment just to be on guard. Many people complain about the high cost of defense. But in a world where despotism wields so much power, freedom is very, very expensive.

Of course, if the Communist regime in Russia were overthrown and replaced ^{non-imperialistic for government,} by a ~~constitutional democracy~~, the East-West struggle would end overnight, and our military burden would ease considerably. But the men who run the Communist world are as tough as ever, and their power seems as secure as ever. So we shall continue to live in a dangerous world -- half slave, half free -- hoping that our politicians will be clever enough to maintain our strength and keep us out of any further military involvements with the Communist world. This can best be achieved by maintaining a strong and firm posture toward the Communists.

Peace. Certain powerful forces in this country are still determined to involve us in a war against South Africa. An article in the October 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs, official publication of the Council on Foreign Relations, leaves little doubt that the financial establishment which uses the CFR to formulate "suggested" foreign policy guidelines for our government still wants to wrest control of Southern Africa from its present white owners. After Vietnam quiets down, we can expect an escalated effort to arouse public

opinion against South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Portuguese Territories. This is something for Americans to guard against, if we are to remain at peace in the Seventies.

In the Middle East peace means only one thing: maintaining Israeli military superiority so that the Jewish state can defend itself against any Arab attack without the help of the United States. If we pressure Israel into giving up the occupied territories without any real concessions from the Arabs, we will be courting disaster. An article in the January 1970 issue of the Readers Digest virtually proposes such a course. Secretary of State Rogers has also voiced somewhat similar views, which are meant more to appease the Arabs than actually preserve the peace.

The Arab-Israeli problem will not be resolved by the United States urging Israel to retreat to its former insecure position while the Soviet Union continues to build up Egypt's aggressive capabilities. If we force Israel into a weakened position with a pledge to come to her aid should her survival be threatened, then we shall be opening the door for another American military involvement 5,000 miles from our shores. If we do not want to become militarily involved in the Middle East then we must support a policy which keeps us out, regardless of whether it seems to favor Israel over the Arabs or is "unbalanced." The Soviet Union seems to have no qualms over "balancing" its policy in the Middle East. They are pro-Arab and anti-Israel, and they admit it.

on the other hand

The United States/is pro-Israel but not anti-Arab. It would like to balance this out a little better. However, to the Arabs it is virtually impossible to be pro-Arab without being anti-Israel. So, how "anti-Israel" must Washington become to satisfy the Arabs?