

for the parties. It would reduce the waiting time for cases. It would save costs to the parties and it would save public funds now committed to Legal Aid. It would lessen the pressure on the Court and avoid the necessity to make further Judicial appointments.

Conclusion

In conclusion I would like to express my view that despite the problems I have outlined, the Family Law Act and the Family Court are working well. The spirit of the legislation is being implemented in many practical ways. The removal of the need to determine fault has reduced the bitterness and animosity often associated with matrimonial proceedings. The Court Counselling Service has been invaluable in helping parties to resolve their conflicts and in providing Reports for the Court.

The faith of those who believed that it was possible within a legal framework to apply solutions other than strictly legal ones to the problems of family breakdown has been justified. The Judges and many members of the legal profession accept readily the value of counselling to the parties. There are some legal practitioners and others who may still have doubts, but one must expect new ideas to take root slowly. Time, experience and education will have their effect.

I believe that there are important decisions to be made about the future administration of family law. These are, essentially, whether it is to develop and expand its conciliation services or whether they are to remain, as now, available only to some and on a limited basis. This will in my opinion, be one of the most important questions for the Joint Select Committee. The proper answer is the key to overcoming many of the difficulties I have discussed. I have made it clear where my own sympathies lie.

THE PARAMETERS OF GOVERNMENT

DON DUNSTAN

There is nothing particularly remarkable in the phenomenon of a large group of earnest people gathering to debate what governments should or should not be doing. In one form or another, that seems to have been happening ever since men started forming themselves into polities and were conscious enough of the fact to discuss it. I suppose it is even less surprising that such an august body as the Australian Regional Groups of the Royal Institute of Public Administration should be delving into the question at its annual conference held in Adelaide to mark the golden jubilee of the South Australian Regional Group. One does attempt to consider the fundamentals at such times.

Nevertheless, it is interesting that in Australia at the present time a good deal of energy is being expended on what is often termed debate about the place of government in our society—or, more accurately, how to place some limits on the encroachment of government into the preserve of private individuals and organizations. It is not exactly a cerebral debate; I think we are quite unlikely to see its exquisite refinement into a determination of how many Australian Cabinet Ministers can jostle for space on the head of a pin. In general terms, I think it is safe to say that we would be optimistic to expect the current discussions, if continued at their present level, to produce many major insights into Australian statecraft. What, then, is the reason for so much discussion of the role of governments in Australia today? It is not a legacy of the Governor-General's dismissal of the Prime Minister three years ago, for that has been working itself out in other directions. Nor does it bear much sign of having been a respectable academic discussion turned virulent and escaped to infect the general populace. In many respects the discussion appears to magnify the apparent level of concern about things political in the community rather than faithfully reflect it. Yet there is a certain robustness and persistence about the discussion that means it must be considered seriously and with some care.

In many Western democracies the current climate of opinion is moving against big government—its absolute size, its complexity, its impersonality, its power, and particularly its cost. Questions are being asked about the appropriate extent of the provision of public services and the imposition of regulations. There are growing expressions of resistance to "government interference in people's lives". Objections on this score are particularly acute when directed against the level of visible taxation, especially when the level of taxation, whether comparatively high or comparatively low, is adjusted frequently.

But these factors have been there for some time. Why do they provoke more reaction now than usual? It may be that these issues have been developing through the sixties and seventies, gradually seeping through into the general consciousness during times of quite remarkable public sector development in some areas, but only comparatively recently surfacing with the credence of ideas in good standing, making people feel they were being borne along in some tidal change of perception and attitude. The extraordinary recent experience of

inflation has heightened the process, not only by highlighting the growth in public sector costs, but also by emphasizing the inability of any institutions but governments to grapple with the enormity of the problem. The limited success they have had, and the accompanying stagnation and unemployment, have made many even more wary than usual of the claims of government over a wide range of activities.

I have said that such developments have been observable in many Western democracies. Perhaps it would have been more accurate to have said in many affluent Western communities, for in many respects the recent questioning of, even scepticism about, the role of government has been one of the first fruits of the affluent welfare State. The articulate questioning, the assertive criticism of all institutions, public and private alike, has been a natural outgrowth of the liberalization of education, attitudes and economic opportunities which has been the common experience of our citizens over the last two decades. What is more natural than that articulate individualism should challenge the personal restrictions and limitations imposed by society through government or the major private institutions? And in this context, restrictions can mean equally the diminution of the buying power of personal disposable income or the specific imposition of limiting regulations.

Superimposed on these developments, however, has been the somewhat traumatic limitation on the quantum of resources available to the public sector as the boom years faded into recession. Public institutions invigorated not only by some years of quickly expanding resources but also by burgeoning demands for public goods and services, were suddenly faced with the need to slow down, run lean and reassess priorities. Like many private businesses faced with the loss of major markets or cut off from development funds, they found difficulty in adapting. Those difficulties gave more opportunities for further questioning of the role of government.

All this makes the situation very complex. But it does serve to emphasize that no simple analysis of the roles of government in a modern society can be of much use. The parameters of government are never static. They fluctuate under the influence of internal and external forces, individual activities and institutional constraints. In this respect the thinness of much of the current discussion is betrayed by its great indulgence in slogans—less taxation, less interference, less government. As a politician, I recognize the value and importance of slogans, but I also recognize how they can convey a misleading impression not only to community leaders, but also to those who adopt them as their battle cry. The message often cuts two ways now.

The Prime Minister, for example, could appear to have been espousing the recent cause of less government, perhaps even before it emerged clearly in the public light, though he and others may source that back to long-standing ideological convictions rather than responsiveness to electoral mood. Yet, for all his actions and pronouncements, the general character of Australian government has not changed significantly. Most people are finding their income tax going up. They are confused by yet another government-dictated change to medical and hospital insurance arrangements, and they read about the government's intention to play a significant role in the marketing of mineral exports.

There may be plenty of talking about limits on government, but it is at this

stage still ill-directed and confused in orientation. Even in the USA, where anti-tax propositions have been passed in a number of States, the action is more of a protest than a launching pad for programs of governmental reform. In Australia an awkward dilemma lies beneath the drift of public opinion. The dilemma was summed up with a nice balance of brevity and irony in a poll taken here shortly after the publicity given to the campaign for passage of Proposition 13 in California. A clear majority of those surveyed declared they wanted less government and in particular a reduction in taxation. On the other hand, an equivalent majority responded to a further question in the same survey that they were not at all keen for the level of public services such as hospitals and health services, education and so on, to be cut back.

It is of course foolish to look for great clarity, consistency or even sense of direction in the course of such broadly based public discussion. Nevertheless, I believe that the confusions and contradictions in the current debate are a reflection of a fairly high degree of confusion and uncertainty over what people want from their government. In many respects, the nature of the continuing discussions on the effects of technological changes on our economy and society is in parallel. They are not marked by a well-developed view of the world nor by a general perception of what the future could bring. Many of the questions are far from new, but the continuing economic recession, the high unemployment, the structural changes either in progress, promised or threatened, and the lack of any obviously anointed Messiah to lead us all on to the next stage of our salvation leave them in a state of somewhat agitated suspense. Action is needed. Change is demanded. But how and when, and even why, it is not easy to specify.

Many points made about the contemporary role of government are couched explicitly or implicitly in negative terms. They declare that government involvement equals bureaucratic meddling, conducted without skill on limited information. They take for granted that anything managed publicly will be managed inefficiently, or at least with some wrong-headed appreciation of what is really needed by the community. The public servant or the public sector manager is necessarily insulated from the insights and expertise open to initiates at the altar of the free enterprise mysteries.

I am no champion of bureaucracy. Overblown bureaucracy can be one of the more pernicious manifestations of modern Western society. I have seen in my time some cases that make Kafka look more like a Hansard reporter than a novelist. But that makes it all too simple. Bureaucracies are not the sole preserve of governments. They are a feature of our major institutions be they public or private. Governments do at times perpetrate acts of gross insensitivity. They do operate in some respects with alarming inefficiency. They do have areas where people are not motivated to serve the public. But so do the major institutions of private enterprise. That does not excuse the aberrations in any way, but it does undermine some of the more simplistic assertions about the role of government.

It is very noticeable that most criticisms of the extent or character of government activity, and most of the slogans that go with them, are aimed at a single aspect of government activity, or reflect a rather narrow view of the nature of government. It is not coincidental that many of the barbs are directed at managerial matters, or are couched in management terms—inefficiency, cost factors, deployment of resources. It is quite normal for public debate of this kind

to be afflicted by some form of tunnel vision, but I think that it goes beyond that in this case. At the bottom there is a tendency on the part of many to declare the government is different from the private sector—which of course it is—but then to proceed to judge its operations, and even its nature by private sector canons. This, however, is to deny much of the reality of public affairs and essential, undisputed public sector activity. Although many aspects of State government activity in particular are managerial, such a preoccupation is misleading. Perhaps the more basic aspects of government activity are concerned with other than managerial tasks and are consequently less susceptible to the managerial approach. It makes as much sense to berate BHP or GMH for the lack of equity in the distribution of their products as it does to run the hard rule of quantitative efficiency, and that alone, over large areas of public sector operations.

Any self-respecting trainee manager could probably look at any government's social welfare programs and identify what he might term areas of waste and inefficiency. The price for eliminating that "waste" and making that area coolly efficient, however, might well be the destruction of an individual's self-respect, the creation of a grim air of suspicion and even persecution in the State's dealing with those of its citizens who have a legitimate claim for assistance. It is unfortunately inevitable in a modern State that freeloaders will, without justice and against the law, inflate the cost of any social welfare program. Our efforts must be bent to limit such abuse, but without destroying the character of the programs involved.

There have been attempts in some places—most notably in the United States—to apply private sector management and evaluation techniques to the operation of public programs. Many useful advances have been made, and some interesting insights have been gained. But the approach has been too simplistic conceptually. While new light has been thrown on some areas, one of the main lessons of the exercise has been to mark out clearly a number of areas which are not normally susceptible to "private sector" treatment. If, for example, normal private sector incentives (the profit motive, the desire for individual gain) are applied to the teaching of reading or other educational attainments, not only should we fail to be surprised if the children being used as guinea pigs respond after a time with classical profit maximization techniques of their own. We should also expect that the nature of the exercise itself will be altered, becoming a lesson in practical economics rather than simply in reading. Similarly, while the use of vouchers for the provision of public housing or education has some attractions in its application of a private market model to provision of social goods and services, it also has major flaws in practice. There is not a perfect market in which these vouchers may be exchanged for public goods. Not all parents will have equally good knowledge about or access to the full range of facilities. A voucher will mean different effective purchasing power in different hands. In public housing, the distortions could be even greater, with the market power and commercial expertise of established companies leaving the voucher holder potentially at a significant disadvantage.

This goes well beyond the familiar differentiation between quantitative and qualitative techniques. It goes beyond the difference in pricing between public and private goods and services. Even if we were able to come up with some reasonably reliable technique for quantifying the currently unquantifiable, some high powered computer system which could take into account all the various

costs and tally up all the benefits of a particular set of options, there is still an important factor unaccounted for. And that is the very nature of government itself.

Government as we know it is not a system of decision-making based on choice between well-defined alternatives. It may be that in part, but it is also, and more importantly, the institutional expression of the hopes, fears, convictions, intentions and conflicts of a vigorous pluralistic society. Government represents, symbolizes, sanctions, protects. The concept of efficiency in such areas is precarious, if not wholly irrelevant. Performance must be, and is, judged on other grounds. No universally valid formulae for such judgement exist. The judgement is made in general terms periodically, at elections.

Government is a group of individuals sharing a defined responsibility for the general operation of the community on whose behalf it exercises a range of coercive powers. In a democracy, government must act as mediator and judge in conflicts and competition between contending groups. Its function is to synthesize, to obtain consensus, to make decisions acceptable to the body politic at large, decisions which will not only be effective in the particular areas of their application, but also maintain the strength and cohesion of the community itself. Many groups operate within the society within a context of rules and conventions. To achieve an effective consensus, government is called upon to administer and adjudicate, arbitrate and authorize. The Government does not, however, hold a monopoly of formal or informal coercive powers in the State. It is itself subject to specific checks and balances. Parliament, the courts, public opinion are powerful constraints. Countervailing power is held and exercised by established private institutions, particularly in matters economic.

On the other hand, the State must protect and support the individual, providing the ultimate guarantee of basic human rights and physical security. There may be shifts in emphasis according to ideology, or perhaps climate, but one of the most remarkable features in modern Western society has been the steady demand for the expansion of public power in social and economic affairs. Although, as I have said before, I believe the signs are confused, we may be seeing some edging away from this at present. Despite all the rhetoric and the occasional heat of the debate, there are no serious arguments being advanced for the withdrawal of government from a position of overall responsibility for economic performance. If anything, there is an increasing emphasis on government responsibility for employment, productivity and broad planning. The debate tends to focus on the larger details rather than the overall situation—a point summed up nicely in the much repeated demands to "stimulate the private sector". That may claim that the best economic health lies through greater activity in non-government areas, but it proclaims loud and clear that the private sector itself is incapable or unwilling to stimulate itself.

It is the government's unique capacity and responsibility to provide an overview of many factors related and unrelated which sets it apart in this respect. And that is precisely what makes it so difficult to declaim any eternal verities about the parameters of government. The whole business of the community is potentially the business of government. But it depends very importantly on the wishes of the people, the mood and needs of the time, whether the government could or would enter upon any given area. Nor is the process one of steady

accretion. A period of conflict, turmoil or change may see the government drawn in heavily, to withdraw to a low-key role as events settle down.

I shall say a little more on economic matters shortly. So far I have been responding to the mainly negative tone of discussion about the role of government but it must be emphasized that regulation is not necessarily a matter of restriction. Government involvement should not be looked upon as an inhibiting factor, for without the intervention of government many of our basic freedoms and enjoyments would not be possible. In South Australia, for example, it has been a fundamental aspect of the government's program to remove unnecessary restrictions on individuals' private activities. In the sphere of homosexuality, the South Australian government has abolished controls over the actions of consenting adult males in private. In the sphere of censorship, the government has removed the arbitrary, politically inspired determination of what people may publicly express, read or see unless there is a specific anti-social element likely to impair the rights and freedoms of others. Positive action has been taken to abolish discrimination against women and to redress the injustices perpetrated against aboriginals.

As a social democratic government, the Labor government in South Australia emphasizes as a key factor in its whole approach the security and fulfilment of the individual in the community. Guarantees of equality and freedom must extend through all aspects of community life, not left confined in the manner of the past. If a person is to play a full part in the life of the community, a premium must be placed on the provision of secure and stable employment, income, housing, health, hospitals, education, protection from exploitation and oppression, access to justice and the general freedom of personal self-expression. This is not a formula for suffocation of initiative. It is rather a secure base from which the individual may strike out constructively in the direction he desires. Not only do we believe the benefits of society must be made available to all members; for society to be as strong and vigorous as possible, all members must have the practical ability to contribute. The fact that the Henderson Inquiry demonstrated that a considerable percentage of the Australian population is still below a conservatively drawn poverty line demonstrates that government still has much to do.

A further area of government concern is that of protection of citizens. If it were not so serious a matter, it would be laughable to hear much of the talk about the need for individual self-reliance in a society free from government controls. That can only come from a blinkered view of the world we live in. In our advanced capitalistic society there is a very uneven sharing of economic and financial power. Some individuals can be vigorous and self-reliant unaided, but most have little chance in the face of corporate might. It is notable that many who are quick to chant for the abolition of government services and restriction of assistance to the needy are personally well off. They are not averse to seeking their share of government aid through careful preparation of their tax returns. The activity is sometimes called capitalizing your gains but socializing your losses.

In South Australia we have probably the most advanced system of consumer protection in the world. State laws aim to prevent the distribution of unsafe products, prohibit false advertising and misrepresentation and provide redress

for consumers through the ability to seek advice and assistance from the Public Service and to have access to the courts. It is remarkable that even some of South Australia's most experienced commercial lawyers have found the need to have access to such services when dealing with their own domestic business. An area of some contention is that of education of the consumer and efforts to protect people from themselves. Despite the debate at the time, there is currently little dispute about the usefulness of laws requiring the wearing of safety belts in cars and the wearing of helmets when riding motorbikes. The value of cooling-off periods in certain contracts is also now accepted.

An emerging area of concern is that of the question of privacy. Governments have a responsibility to check the dangers of malevolent uses of modern technology. One example concerns privacy of information about the individual, and its proper control. These days, with computer technology, even if the individual parts seem innocuous, the ability to gather together quickly a comprehensive dossier on the individual may result in a situation which goes far beyond that for which an individual thought he or she was providing information. My government is concerned that people should have a right to refuse access to personal details, to ensure that whatever information is kept on people and is likely to be used in judgement upon them is available only with the knowledge of individuals and is relevant only to the specific uses for which it is gathered, is not an unwarranted intrusion into personal matters and is not biased or false or malicious. Individuals should have the right to challenge the validity or relevance of data and have the right to have data erased. It is the responsibility of government also to consider the provision of means of protection of individuals against gathering and dissemination of certain information by the publicity media, private detectives, telephone tapping and mail surveillance, and prying neighbours and landlords. At all times, however, there needs to be a balance of the two sides—the right of privacy and the interest of the individual against the goals and values of society as a whole, that is, of freedom of speech and communication and national security.

These and other matters show the importance of the government's role from time to time as an agent or prime mover of desirable change. Although many at times choose to deny it, a fundamental role of government is to exercise leadership and foresight on behalf of the community. That is often a rather thankless task. When new ground is being broken there are always critics and detractors claiming that issues are being forced for sectional reasons, that individual rights are being ignored or other social factors are being taken too lightly. But they are equally willing to throw the first stone if, after the event, governments fail to have perceived an emerging trend or have failed to take action, and failed to lead satisfactorily through a period of difficulty. One of the most important current examples of that is industrial democracy. In our view all the forces are there. The developments are in progress. The changes will come, but it would be derelict of the government simply to stand by and wait for them to evolve at their own speed and in their own manner.

To return to the question of the government's role *vis-a-vis* the economy. If there is a consistent line of opinion critical of government involvement it is that the government should withdraw to a very general macro-economic role, leaving the individual actors in the market to contend and compete with one another according to the demands of individual purchasers. In this way the beneficial

forces of free enterprise will be brought into play most effectively with a consequent efficiency, optimal allocation of resources, and stimulation of economic activity. Particular complaints are directed at consumer protection legislation, payroll taxes, workers' compensation and any other specific regulatory provision imposed by government. There is some force in the arguments, I must admit, and I have recognized that by the progressive liberalization of incentive arrangements in this State for the expansion of existing industry and the attraction of new industries.

But the formula is too simple. Although government-imposed costs may be most readily identifiable and in some respects most difficult to avoid, they are not the only costs, fixed or otherwise, faced by businesses. It is, however, much easier to attack workers' compensation than to grumble at a plethora of individual suppliers. It is much easier to throw rocks at the government than to take on the enormous task of getting industry and commerce organized to act cooperatively to improve those aspects under their control.

There has been a strong economic bias in the development of government activities in Western democracies in the last forty or fifty years. This was seen particularly in the sixties and seventies and this concentration has brought with it problems of adjustment when times have turned bad. In the past the challenge has been the rapid provision of services to meet accelerating demand. The challenge now is to streamline to ensure the provision of efficient and effective services and to ensure that new and improved initiatives are not blocked by the wastage of available resources or their diversion to outmoded ends.

Governments do have a heavy responsibility and, particularly in this critical period of economic stagnation, responsibility lies with the national government. Manufacturing industry in particular is in trouble. Hundreds of thousands of people are unemployed. Unless the economy picks up soon thousands of Australia's youth are doomed to an extended period of economic and psychological deprivation. The causes are manifold. Some are directly attributable to the actions of government and as I have said publicly many times before I believe they are susceptible to actions presently within the power of the Federal government. But there is little to be gained by a demarcation dispute between the public and the private sector, and even less to be gained by a slanging match. If we face up to the realities of our present situation we will recognize that it is neither a private problem nor a public problem. It is both.

We do not live in some strange land divided into neat sections in which quite different considerations come into play. Whether we like to recognize it or not, we live in a mixed advanced economy. Whatever our ideological preconceptions, there will be significant areas of activity in which government and private enterprise must work side by side. I do not mean by this that the government should continue to develop new and intriguing means of covertly subsidizing the operations of industry while industry trumpets the virtues of a hands-off approach by government. Even less do I mean some cosy sweetheart relationship in which industry and government form a coalition with little respect for the interests of the taxpayer. What I mean is a broadly based program of cooperative planning and action designed to achieve the best possible results for our community.

South Australia has gone as far as most with the traditional forms of

assistance to industry. We have incentives to encourage industrial research and the development of specially advanced technology. The State's Small Business Advisory Service counsels firms with financial and other management problems. The government provides trade information, promotional avenues and publicity. The South Australian Development Corporation provides loans, guarantees and equity participation. The South Australian Housing Trust provides serviced land. The government provides grants assisting firms' cash flow positions in the early years of development. It also provides for industry planning, involving studies and projections of the State's economic development, the structure of industry, including the identification of sectors with the most promising growth potential and greatest spin-off benefit to other industries, as well as the effects of State and Commonwealth government policies.

The government has also become directly involved in the economy and is not ashamed to claim Sir Thomas Playford as a mentor in this area. He nationalized the private power companies, for example. The Labor government has sought to go further, enhancing competition and improving public services by establishing key bodies in important sectors—the State Government Insurance Commission, the South Australian Land Commission, the South Australian Film Corporation. It has reinvigorated the activities of such bodies as the South Australian Housing Trust and the State and Savings Banks of South Australia.

We have found the need to go much further, if you like, to blur the distinction between private and public sector, by an outgoing and entrepreneurial approach to the marketing of our State's assets and protection of its employment opportunities. In the face of inability or unwillingness of the private sector to use the State's resources to capitalize on opportunities to increase sales or facilitate diversification, the State has found the need to become directly involved in identifying market opportunities here and overseas, setting up consulting arrangements, feeling out the ground for possible pilot projects and identifying chances for the sale of new or existing South Australian products. Progress has necessarily been slow but we are starting to see the fruits of the effort. It has been disappointing to us that private enterprise has been so reluctant to put in the effort and take the risks involved. It would be more flattering to the State if the latter day copying of our actions by other States, and now the Federal government, could have been viewed from a position of greater strength, with many local firms fully committed and looking for expanding opportunities. Although it is somewhat slow to emerge we hope that this change will come.

For this process to continue and mature, there is a need to develop a greater understanding between the principal parties. Public servants are challenged to develop a greater knowledge and understanding of industrial and commercial thinking and practice. Private sector managers are seeing more clearly the particular demands on their public sector counterparts and the different factors which must be taken into account in their decision-making. In both areas we need skilled people with a greater depth of background in all aspects of the mixed economy. We must move to exchange personnel from private companies to government departments and vice versa. We must break down the barriers of understanding.

The account I have given of the role of government has been a very wide one and fairly diffuse at that, but I believe that it is positive and vigorous in intent, adaptable to changing circumstances but always intent on protecting the best interests of the citizen.

THE PARAMETERS OF GOVERNMENT

GORDON BARTON

Introduction

What should be the role of government? This is a question almost as old as the history of man and to many people, including me, the most important issue of our time.

I should first define my terms. Government is the administration of political power by the sovereign authority of the State. More concisely, it is the day-to-day exercise of ultimate political power. Let me also explain my own general view about this. I believe that the truest thing ever said on this subject was Lord Acton's proposition: all power tends to corrupt; absolute power corrupts absolutely. Thus, if not an anarchist, then I should be put with those who regard government as a necessary evil.

The primary justification of government is that it provides security without which society cannot survive and progress. In the old days this was a matter of organizing defence against foreigners and establishing machinery for resolving internal disputes. Very few would question that societies need security, and law and order, for their survival and progress. Let us remind ourselves, however, that governments vary in their style—from Genghis Khan to Idi Amin, from Pericles to Don Dunstan. Hitler's holocaust was an interpretation of what was required for the security of Germany at a particular time. It involved the genocide of several million people. The Gulag Archipelago is a more recent example of an interpretation of the role of government in maintaining law and order.

The majority of people are concerned that the objectives of defence and law and order are met effectively, economically and with a concern for and sensitivity to the needs of individuals. Historically, however, governments have not fared well by these tests of effectiveness, economy, or sensitivity, either in respect of their traditional functions or their more modern extensions into such fields as education, health, and economic activities. There are two reasons why this is so. The first is size, the second is power.

The Problems of Size and Power

In the matter of size even the management consultants now agree that the efficiency of any organization is inversely proportional to the square of the number of the people engaged in it. Large organizations also tend to be less economical, and it is notorious that they are less sensitive to the individuals with whom they collide. One does not have to be a gourmet to know that one does not eat well in large establishments—or cheaply either.

The lessening of sensitivity, of responsibility, is an almost inevitable consequence of organization, because organization involves delegation and indirect communication. The six inches of bayonet that is poked into a soldier's stomach is important to him but lost in the statistics of steel production converted to military purposes. It is easier to drop a bomb from 10,000 feet that will kill a whole family, or several, than it is to kill one man face to face. Easier