

greater proliferation is obviously precluded for me by my own commitment to nonproliferation. However, there is no evidence that China has ever taken any material action to promote proliferation.

The suggestion that nonnuclear states should divert their pressure from the U.S. to the USSR ignores one of the biggest facts of life in contemporary world politics: On defense and disarmament issues, most nonnuclear states tend to view the Superpowers as mirror images of each other and to subject them to equal criticism. There was no peculiarly anti-American animus at Geneva last May. In fact, the strains between Soviet and nonnuclear delegations were notably acute.

What is more amiss with Weber's "Goldwaterism" (his word!) is his claim that the Soviet Union has been

more provocative recently than the U.S. and that Schlesinger's dismissal is a "good clue to where the action is." I have no interest in trying to prove the innocence of the Soviet Union's weapons policies and force deployments; that cannot be done. But those policies and deployments need to be seen in parallel with U.S. MIRV expansion, the confused dogmas and threats of "counterforce" and possible "first use," R & D on cruise missiles and MARVs, a \$92 billion B-1 bomber force, Trident submarines at \$2 billion each, and renegeing on the Vladivostok understanding that Soviet *Backfire* (medium) bombers were not to be included in the Ford-Brezhnev ceiling of 2,400 strategic delivery vehicles. On the public record it is readily arguable that the U.S. is at least as responsible for the SALT impasse as the USSR is.

Finally, I really didn't mean to seem

very theological in my use of the word "covenant" to refer to the NPT. Of course, the "working ethic" of the U.S. and USSR in drafting their original versions of the NPT was anything but covenantal. The "good faith" obligations of Article VI, along with provision for a review conference, were clearly imposed upon the Superpowers as the political price of subscription by nonnuclear powers. Recalling those very political circumstances hardly diminishes the covenantal character of the treaty, however. It reminds us that this was indeed the crucial, central, solemn bargain without which the Superpowers would never have gotten their treaty at all. Which is why so many nonnuclear states are so thoroughly disillusioned over the Non-Proliferation Treaty—and why political realism, at least sometimes, coincides with ethical integrity.

## Correspondence

[from p. 2]

Finally, strengthening the U.N. is impossible so long as it reflects the present diversity of purposes and systems in the world. Thirty years ago it was understandable that many viewed the U.N. as the "last, best hope for peace." But we have seen, unhappily, that a generation of experience renders that outlook naive.

## Social Power

To the Editors: Allow me a brief response to your "Briefly Noted" review of our publication, *Poverty in American Democracy: A Study of Social Power* (Worldview, October, 1975). It is true that we call for a serious examination of the allocation of resources and economic decision-making through the institution of private property and free enterprise. This is due to our fear that decisions for public goods, infrastructural development and human resources development are being made in ways which benefit some regions and economic

groupings in our country unjustly at the expense of others. Certainly we did not call for abolition of the institution of private ownership, but do suggest that it would be more equitable, and that it was intended to be more equitable by many leaders at the founding of our country....

I think it is an overstatement to suggest we are "preoccupied" with redistribution of wealth, although we do mention the idea after examining how lopsided productive wealth ownership is in our country. Your reviewer makes no mention of whether our "preoccupations" are true or not....

About the only statement in your review which seems possibly fair is his/her critique of our style in the suggestion that "run-of-the-pew Catholics" could be offended by the material, and that it will fail to mobilize Catholics to build a better society. That is, of course, possible. It is too early to say. In any case, we do not think of our people as "run-of-the-pew," and trust in what judgment they would make after reading the book for themselves....

Frederick J. Perella  
Assistant Education Coordinator  
Campaign for Human Development  
U.S. Catholic Conference  
Washington, D.C.

## CHANGING YOUR ADDRESS?

Please notify the  
*Worldview*  
subscription department  
six weeks in advance  
of your move to  
insure uninterrupted  
delivery of the journal.

V 1 9 / 1 1 / 2

J A N I F F E B

7 6



FIRST CLASS  
PERMIT NO. 27806  
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10021

**BUSINESS REPLY MAIL**

NO POSTAGE STAMP NECESSARY IF MAILED IN THE UNITED STATES

Postage Will Be Paid By:

**WORLDVIEW**

170 EAST 64th ST.  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK, 10021



WORLDVIEW  
ONE YEAR  
**[10 ISSUES]**

\$250

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

**BIGGER SAVINGS**

I prefer to save \$7. Enter my  
subscription for two years (20 issues)  
for only \$18.

Payment enclosed

Bill me