

area who had the most to gain from being defended (large landholders, insurance agencies and the like) and inform them that they would have to pay a price for defense.

In all these ways, a national defense agency might raise enough money to finance national defense without taxation. Obviously, a system which depends on local agencies evolved for a different

purpose, or a ramshackle system financed by charity, passport sales and threats to Hawaiian insurance companies, is economically very imperfect. So is a system financed by coercion. Fortunately, since the cost of a satisfactory national defense is much less than its value, a solution may be imperfect and still be satisfactory. □

## Student Unrest... The Search for Values

Allan C. Brownfeld

It has been said that the "generation gap" is an exaggeration. This may be the case on one level, for when we discuss the attitudes of the "young" we generally refer not to the majority of those below the age of twenty-five, but only to that small percentage of affluent young people residing on college campuses. There is not only a gap between this group of students and their parents but there is an equal and perhaps greater gap between them and their own contemporaries who have not gone to college. This consideration aside, however, the fact remains that a real "gap" does exist.

The generation gap we do have is perhaps the key to understanding today's youthful rebellion and student unrest. Though all of us young, middle-aged and old live in the mid-twentieth century, only the young—those who have come of age since the conclusion of World War II—are truly of this period. Those who lived through the Depression or through World War II have been frozen by the dramatic and intense experience of those days.

The Southern writer, Walter Hines Page, wrote this with regard to the generation which lived during the Civil War in the South: "It (the Civil War) gave every one of them the intensest experience of his life and ever afterwards he referred every other experience to this. Thus it stopped the thought of most of them as an earthquake stops a clock. The fierce blow of battle paralyzed the mind. Their speech was the vocabulary of war...they were dead men, most of them, moving among the living as ghosts; and yet, as ghosts in a play, they held the stage."

So it is with today's young who are, in a sense, frozen with the dramatic and intense experience of these days. They do not relate the upheavals of today with the past. They know no past except through the books most of them do not read. They live in the present and wonder what future they may hope for in so transient and unstable a world. If there is a generation gap it is of this nature. The generations need interpreters to understand one another and there are few.

in days of yore

A young man growing up in Europe one or two hundred years ago would have faced

a situation in which the major decisions in his life were pre-ordained. More than likely, he would have been born in the same house in which his father had been born, almost surely in the same town. He would pursue the same vocation as did his father. If his father were a tailor or butcher, the son would also live his life in this manner. His marriage would be arranged. His own range of choice was very slight. Life was circumscribed by religious faith and communal custom. The individual was part of the community, of the group. His responsibility was more that of playing out his role than grasping life as a horseman at the reigns and riding in whatever direction he willed.

Today man's situation is far different. Young Americans have almost unlimited choices with regard to career, location, marriage and other basic elements of life-style. Certainly there are restrictions. The draft claims two years out of the lives of many young men. Some start life in humbler surroundings than others. Yet, on the whole, the young man or woman coming of age in America at this time has perhaps a greater freedom to choose his pattern of living than any individual in history.

Freedom to choose, however, becomes a very difficult task when no one provides any knowledge about the basis upon which such choices may beneficially be made. At one time the family, the school and the church spent a good deal of time pointing young people in particular directions which they considered to be valid and time-tested. Today the family is in a state of disarray, the school pursues a "value-free" curriculum and the church being swept away in the modern tide of relativism—doubts its own message.

Not too long ago The New Yorker featured a cartoon in which one Priest said to another: "I would not be so presumptuous as to tell the congregation what was right and what was wrong." In one of the most important volumes advocating the new variety of Protestant theology, The Secular City, Professor Harvey Cox of the Harvard Divinity School notes that man in the modern world is no longer concerned with what theologian Paul Tillich called the "ultimate questions," namely those concerning life, death and meaning.

Cox declares "...they are obviously not

questions which occur to everyone, or indeed to the vast majority of the people. They do not disturb the newly-emergent urban-secular man very frequently. They arise, in fact, not from the structure of existence at all but from the erosion of inherited world views and cultural meanings...We have found technopolitan man to be pragmatic and profane."

Cox urges the modern church to turn away from metaphysical questions. Instead, he argues, it should enter the social and political arena: "...in secular society politics does what metaphysics once did. It brings unity and meaning to human life and thought. In today's world, we unify the various scholarly and scientific specialties by focusing them on specific human issues...Theology today must be that reflection-in-action by which the church finds out what this politician God is up to and moves into work along with him. In the epoch of the secular city, politics replaces metaphysics as the language of theology."

Harvey Cox's insights into the nature of the modern world and of modern man should by no means be deprecated; he has, indeed, broken much new ground. But too much of his advice has been taken at face value. Too many churches have turned their backs upon the metaphysical questions which he says that man is no longer asking, and have become political. It is proper to be concerned about open housing, the war in Vietnam, hunger and poverty. But man has a spiritual nature which must be nourished, and this spirituality has been virtually ignored.

What many young people are seeking is a perspective on life which is no longer presented by the traditional institutions. The mood of modern religion was captured by Evelyn Waugh when he wrote in Brideshead Revisited: "I had no religion. I was taken to church weekly as a child, and at school attended chapel daily, but, as though in compensation, from the time I went to my public school I was excused from church on the holidays. The view implicit in my education was that the basic narrative of Christianity had long been exposed as myth, and that opinion was now divided as to whether its ethical teaching was of present value, a division in which the main weight went against it; religion was a hobby which some people professed and others did not. At best it was slightly ornamental; at worst, it was the province of 'complexes' and 'inhibitions'—catchwords of the decade—and of the intolerance, hypocrisy and sheer stupidity attributed to it for centuries. No one ever suggested to me that these quaint observances expressed a coherent philosophic system and intransigent historical claims..."

The student protest movement is asking the very "ultimate questions" to which Tillich referred and which modern theologians say have disappeared. Where they will find answers to such questions in what they view as a materialistic and dehumanized age is difficult to say.

touch me where...

Describing this spiritual vacuum and spiritual search, the English poet, Stephen Spender, wrote The Year of The Young Rebels: "They are not primarily concerned with seizing power, and it is difficult to see how they could be, unless they

were to merge their identity as students into some longer term revolutionary movement. They do not consider the aim of their revolution to be victory over the current establishment, followed by the setting up of a dictatorship... Their revolutionary idea is... moral passion. The essential is that they regard the society against which they are rebelling as intolerable to their sense of life, for which 'spontaneity,' 'participation,' etc. are the names... What is most significant about the students' revolution is that it is directed against all existing forms of industrial society."

Professor Theodore Roszak also expresses the view that those who declared that "God is dead" and that young people were no longer concerned with spiritual questions were wrong. In fact, a basic element in student protest is the rejection of society, rather than one of traditional values.

In his important study, *The Making Of a Counter-Culture*, Roszak points out that "...we may have been decidedly wrong in what we long expected to follow the death of the Christian God; namely, a thoroughly secularized, thoroughly positivistic culture, dismal and spiritless in its obsession with technological prowess. That was the world Aldous Huxley foresaw in the 1930s when he wrote *Brave New World*. But in the 1950s, as Huxley detected the rising spirit of a new generation, his utopian image brightened to the forecast he offers us in *Island*, where a non-violent culture elaborated out of Buddhism and psychedelic drugs prevails. It was as if he had suddenly seen the possibility emerge: what lay beyond the Christian era and 'wasteland' that was its immediate suc-

cessor might be a new, eclectic religious revival. Which is precisely what confronts us now as one of the massive facts of the counter-culture. The dissenting young have indeed got religion..."

If one scans the underground press, one is apt to find their pages swarming with Christ and the prophets, Zen, Sufism, Hinduism, primitive shamanism, theosophy and the Left-Handed Tantra. Professor Roszak states that "...their number grows and the counter-culture makes a generous place for them. No anti-war demonstration would be complete without a hirsute, be-cowbelled contingent of holy men, bearing hoss sticks and intoning the Hare Krishna."

Much of the questioning from young people, not only in the spiritual and ethical field but in other fields, is good. Many existing standards and values do, indeed, need criticism. For too long society has accepted the idea that through government, all problems could be solved. Young people did not live through the optimistic days of the New Deal when many believed that if you created enough government agencies and spent enough federal money, all problems—poverty, social inequality, poor housing or whatever—could be solved. They are beneficiaries only of the results.

#### vision through a file cabinet

As many of them see it, our government has become bureaucratically inert and unresponsive to the needs of the people. What is more, it has become coercive. It compels workers to pay unwanted social security; it even compels Americans

under penalty of fine and jail to answer personal questions on census forms.

Young people see that such coercion has not solved our problems but has, in many respects, compounded them. They also are concerned with the university, where most of them are now students. They have seen students become the least important commodity at the university as government and private foundations lure professors into writing and research projects.

It must be remembered that there are many legitimate grievances with regard to the university and the educational process. Irving Kristol has noted that "...in the overwhelming majority of universities liberal education is extinct." In *The Academic Revolution*, Christopher Jencks and David Riesman point out that this revolution began at the end of World War II when the demand for higher education began to grow with explosive speed. The complexity of the mass technological society required many more university-trained specialists. As a result, a diploma became an almost indispensable document. The role of the academician rose in prestige, leading to a change in the university.

Harper's Magazine editor, John Fischer, has remarked about the nature of this change: "...the professoriat soon began to reshape the university to serve its own desires rather than those of the students or their parents. For one thing teachers today are doing less and less teaching. Jencks and Riesman note that 'until World War II even senior scholars at leading universities did a good deal of what they defined as scut work; teaching small groups of lower level students, reading papers and examinations and the like. . . Today, however, few well-known scholars teach more than six hours a week, and in leading universities many bargain for less. . . the routine problems of mass higher education have therefore fallen by default to graduate students.' . . . Research, of course, is what he had better be committed to, for that alone pays off in money and reputation. It doesn't have to be significant research. Much of it, at least in the social sciences and humanities tends to resemble finger exercises for the piano. It is not concerned with answering real questions or solving real problems."

What disturbs many students, therefore, is the fact that their own education has suffered. No longer are students considered the most vital part of a university. Mr. Fischer places much of the student restlessness in this perspective: "I believe it is the beginning of a counter-revolution by students—liberal arts undergraduates in particular—against a quiet, almost unremarked revolution which has changed the whole structure of American higher education within the last two or three decades. The main beneficiaries of that revolution were the faculty. The victims were the liberal arts undergraduates. Only recently have these students begun to understand how they are victimized—and their protest is likely to swell at least until some of the results of the earlier revolution are reversed."

While many young people are asking all the valid and important questions to which



"... Sweden—where government plays a major role, yet remains handmaiden of the people."

Paul Samuelson—Newsweek



we have alluded, the fact remains that there is a serious dichotomy between the leaders of the New Left—the Tom Haydens, the Jerry Rubins, the Rennie Davises—and the young people who form the core of the movement—the ones who attend protests and demonstrations, the ones who, in the privacy of their own contemplation, feel depressed and disillusioned and wonder what the future may hold.

The leaders are, in many instances, at least ten years older than the followers. More important, they are professionals. Leading protests is often all they do. Many of them have the wild gleam in their

## Great American Series

"Uh... well... like... what I mean to say is... uh... ya know... man?"

Peter Fonda

"Like they're killing peeople I mean ya know?"

Jane Fonda

eyes—for them the "revolution" is more of a personal obsession than a public necessity.

We have, of course, seen this before. Revolutionary leaders have always managed to gather followers not by promising them tyranny, but by associating themselves with the deepest aspirations of the group they seek to use.

Lenin promised the Russian people bread, peace and land, not Communism. Castro promised the Cubans constitutional democracy, not Communism. Mao Tse-tung promised the Chinese agrarian reform, not Communism. Yet, once in power, the promises were forgotten and the revolutionary leaders proceeded with their long-established blueprint. Likewise, the New Left leaders promise college students alcohol and girls in dormitory rooms, an end to the draft and a "purpose" for life, namely the liberation of the "oppressed." It sounds good and noble, and the requisite support has been forthcoming.

The fact that young people have many valid questions does not diminish the danger of many of the activities, leaders and organizations which have in many instances been blindly entered by students who were not aware of the long-run implications of their actions.

### the beauty of the bomb

Many of the leaders of such militant organizations as Students for a Democratic Society do not hesitate to support the use of violence. A leaflet prepared in Toronto, Canada and distributed in early 1968 to S. D. S. chapters throughout the country contains instructions on how to make Molotov cocktails and incendiary time bombs. Urging sabotage as "the next logical step toward obstruction and disruption of the U.S. war machine," the leaflet says that it is ludicrous to think that demonstrations closing down induction centers for a few hours will really hurt Selective Service.

"On the other hand," the leaflet says, "is there anyone who doubts that a small home-made incendiary device with a

timing mechanism planted in a broom closet at the Oakland induction center could result in fire and smoke damage to the entire building, thus making it unusable for weeks or months? One person with a fair knowledge of chemistry could build such a device easily and cheaply and could plant it with almost no chance of being detected."

Since those early days the nation has witnessed a mounting campaign of domestic violence. A physics student was killed as a bomb exploded at the University of Wisconsin, and the United States Capitol itself was shaken by a blast allegedly planted by militant antiwar groups. S. D. S. spokesman, Steve Weissman, feels the time for rational discourse has ended and the time for violence has arrived: "What the University has done is to get us to think for a number of years that social problems can be solved by rational discussion... There's no conversation between us and the C. I. A. We're on different sides. I hope people will now see that force is a part of the world."

The majority of those who advocate violence either to change the system or to improve it are unaware of the historical consequences of violent upheavals. George Bernard Shaw wrote that "Revolution never lightens the burden of tyranny, it simply shifts it from one shoulder to another." That violence is the solution to our current difficulties is, observing the historical record, very unlikely.

Crusades which initially seek to throw off the fetters of an old order have simply replaced them with new fetters. The French Revolution led to the Reign of Terror, the Russian Revolution to Stalin, the Chinese Revolution to Mao Tse-tung. The tyrannies which follow violent revolutions have been infinitely more brutal than the autocracies they replaced. The New Left's advocacy of violence is, however, not its only danger. Its blindness to totalitarianism and its hostility to the traditional American concept of free speech is of equal significance.

Many in the New Left are intolerant of viewpoints other than their own. In his *A Critique of Pure Tolerance*, Professor Herbert Marcuse states that people who are confused about politics really don't know how to use freedom of speech correctly; they turn it into "an instrument for absolving servitude," so "that which is radically evil now appears as good." Having established this premise, Marcuse recommends "the withdrawal of toleration of speech and assembly from groups which promote aggressive policies, armament, chauvinism, racial and religious discrimination or which oppose the extension of public services."

For him, the correct political attitude is one of "intolerance against movements from the right and toleration of movements from the left." The practical result of such a philosophy was seen when former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara had to enter a police wagon to avoid crowds at Harvard, when Henry Cabot Lodge was not permitted to speak at Stanford, when students charged the podium at Brown University as General Earle Wheeler spoke, and when New York

Times editor James Reston was unable to finish his talk at New York University.

A student strike at the University of California brought a significant statement from Charles Susskind, a professor of electrical engineering and a man who had seen at first hand how in the thirties the Nazis created "political universities" in Germany. He said the New Left at Berkeley reminded him very much of "the young Nazis of the thirties."

An example of the disregard for the totalitarian nature of Communism may be found in the proceedings of the Students for a Democratic Society, largest of the New Left organizations. This group included in its 1962 Port Huron statement a denunciation of "colonialism, communism, and anti-communism." In 1965 it eliminated from its constitution clauses barring "advocates and apologists of totalitarianism" and opposing "authoritarianism of both communism and the domestic right." Such provisions, they explained, were "negative and exclusionary" and "smacked of red baiting."

As a result many communists have flocked to the ranks of S. D. S. Commenting on the group's last real convention, *The New Republic* observed that the Progressive Labor Party—the Peking-oriented Communist organization—"is heavily represented within S. D. S. because the party sees S. D. S. as a recruiting ground for new members." It noted that at the convention P. L. delegates "continually pushed the idea that students should ally with the traditional working class in a common 'struggle' against the ruling class."

Student unrest is complex and difficult to understand. On the one hand, there are many honest young people with valid grievances, asking important questions. On the other hand, there are disingenuous leaders attempting to use this idealism for their own ends—many of which are totalitarian and dedicated to the destruction of American society.

It is essential that young people be made aware of the real nature and intentions of the New Left activists. It is also essential that society show some concern for their

## Great American Series

We did not choose to be the guardians at the gate, but there is no one else."

Lyndon Johnson

valid grievances. This generation must come to grips with a complicated world, and all of us must plan for a future in which our traditional view of the dignity of man, free speech and orderly procedure will be maintained.

College administrators and legislators who condemn all young people for the excesses of a few simply compound the problem. Those who are willing to accept the excesses, as many college administrators seem surprisingly willing to do, are doing themselves and the society a disservice. No one should offer a podium or audience to those who have committed violent acts. But no grievances which students wish to discuss peacefully should

be considered out of the bounds of discourse.

Society, however, must defend itself from those who advocate its destructions. If society will not defend itself, if the university will not defend itself, it is an indication that the S. D. S. and other revolutionaries are right, that America has lost the will to endure, that the intellectual community believes nothing is worth preserving. Hopefully, this is not the case. □

## Who, Me?

# The Case Against the Draft

Arnold Steinberg

Given a choice between the draft and a volunteer military, most Americans would accept only one justification for the draft—that there is no alternative. Last year the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force (the Gates Commission) completed detailed studies and confirmed what military manpower experts have long proposed—that the alternative of an all-volunteer force is feasible and desirable.

The draft has been rarely used in the United States, and never used during peacetime until the period following World War II. Although most troops in the Civil War were volunteers, the draft was still used. It necessitated the suspension of habeas corpus following draft protests, and its overall effect was compromised by exemption, commutation and substitution.

During part of World War I draftees were used, and contrary to the earliest American tradition of home militias, draftees were used in combat outside the United States. The supply of volunteers was stifled because military compensation and allowances remained unchanged and no enlistment bounties were introduced.

The use of conscription during World War II underutilized various groups, including Negroes, who were discriminated against, and farmers, who were deferred. The use of furloughs, permitting soldiers to collect double pay while working in a factory, induced adequate volunteers.

The draft has always been alien to American tradition. Despite fashionable interpretations of a few court decisions, its constitutionality has never been settled. The constitution gave the federal government the power to raise armies, but if this could be done without conscription, there is no reason to assume that conscription is sanctioned by the constitution.

The most persistent characteristic of the draft, the few times it has been utilized in American history, and virtually all the time in the history of other nations, is that conscription represents a hidden tax-in-kind. Consider conscripts and draft-induced volunteers (as opposed to true volunteers) who would not join the military at present levels of compensation unless they were coerced into joining. The difference between the level of compensation they receive and the level which would induce them to volunteer represents

*Allan C. Brownfeld, once the editor of The New Guard, is a columnist for Roll Call. His articles have appeared in Human Events, The Yale Review, The Texas Quarterly, Commonweal, and Modern Age. He is a recipient of a Wall Street Journal Foundation Award.*

a hidden tax. This discriminatory tax is borne only by those men who render compulsory service.

Any society unwilling to tax its members to finance the military resorts to this immortal alternative—coercing some men into the military, forcing them to bear this tax-in-kind (a tax on their labor). Because the manpower pool (healthy men within a given age group who are mentally qualified for service) has usually substantially exceeded military requirements, deferments have been a convenient way to exclude a large share of this pool. The result is that the poor and black bear the primary burden of this tax.

Ironically, the Ritualistic Liberal who opposes the voluntary military charges that it would create a poor man's army; yet statistics indicate that we actually have a poor man's army (including military families on public assistance and food stamps). As long as first-term recruits are paid less than the federal minimum wage, anti-military ritualists who prate against a volunteer military and poverty clearly contradict themselves.

Although Ritualistic Liberals also charge that blacks would compromise a disproportionate share of the volunteer military, studies indicate that the percentage of blacks in the military would not significantly change. One wonders why these Liberals would deny this avenue of opportunity and higher wages to blacks. One Gates Commission researcher estimated, only partially tongue-in-cheek, that if black recruits were paid twenty per cent less than their white counterparts, the military's racial composition would precisely reflect that of society.

Because most of the military is composed of true volunteers (considering the number of men who re-enlist after their initial term), the need is for enough volunteers per year to maintain forces at effective strength. Pay increases which would more than double the direct compensation of a first-term recruit would entice adequate volunteers.

The volunteer military would also increase the percentage of the military in effective status as opposed to training status (men being trained or training others).

The present system requires training—at considerable cost—of large

numbers of men for periods ranging from four to seven months; most of these men serve in the military only for the remainder of a two-year term. By increasing the average length of service of a soldier, efficiency will increase. In fact, volunteers tend to be more productive than conscripts, and a change from conscription to all-volunteer forces would necessarily mean a more efficient military.

Currently the draftee is expendable—not merely in combat but in any task. Although, some Ritualistic Liberals charge a volunteer military would create a caste system, the present system is a caste system, with first-term recruits, especially draftees, in one caste, and higher-ranking officers in another.

Any system with unlimited manpower supplied at absurdly low rates is not merely inefficient and unresponsive to change, but it has no incentive to meet the needs of the first-term recruit. One result, partially produced by such a system, is the disgraceful casualty and death rates in combat in Vietnam. Officers are required to serve a tour of duty in Vietnam to be considered for promotion, and they spend six months on a combat tour, then are replaced by another officer. Hence conscripts are denied the proper and experienced leadership to which they are morally and practically entitled in combat. Although, this argument is a favorite of anti-war types, Vietnam war supporters in the Pentagon have privately criticized the poor leadership provided to draftees in combat.

Perhaps the most interesting observation on the volunteer military debate is that the objections of most Ritualistic Liberals, as indicated earlier, are reasons for a volunteer military. One hears talk of military intervention and coups which would follow the end of a "citizen's army"—but all the historical studies of the Gates Commission demonstrate a high correlation between military influence (including coups) and conscription. In other words, a volunteer military would not preclude civilian control, but has always tended to correlate with it; totalitarian regimes have always depended on conscription.

The present system is discriminatory and unfair, wasteful and inefficient. The bureaucratic selective service system, costly and arbitrary as it is, disrupts the lives of millions of young Americans. Its uncertainties cause some to attend college who should not be there. In altering the career or marriage plans of others, as well as its distortion of higher education, the draft incurs real costs for society which are incalculable. Conscription encourages the use of manpower in wars where air and naval power should be more heavily utilized.

The alternative, at a net cost estimated reliably at between two and four billion dollars, would restore the voluntary tradition of military service which has characterized nearly the entire history of the United States. It would result in a more professional, efficient and effective military force—response to both our national security and to the precious Western value of individual freedom. □