



To the Editor:

Poor Michael Clurman (March) has "not seen a single modern cogent, moral argument for accepting the distribution of income which a free market presents us with." Perhaps he hasn't really looked.

My income in a free market represents what other people are perfectly willing to give up in order to acquire my services, or the goods to which my labor contributes (in this case, *NATIONAL REVIEW*). Except for monopoly or theft, income is a measure of one's exchange value to others.

Now, Why does Mr. Clurman feel morally justified in forcing me, with the help of however large a majority, to share that which has been freely given to me for my considerable efforts? Contrary to the opening quote, I do not have an unnatural monopoly over libertarian economics, nor have I stolen anything from *NATIONAL REVIEW*'s beloved subscribers. True, I did "inherit" a vocabulary and some tuition money from my parents (though I lived, rent-free, in a dog hospital), but that was **their** right since their incomes were also obtained without force or fraud.

The dollars I have symbolize what I have created, just as surely as a pot belongs to the potter who made it. If Clurman wishes to take my little pot of wealth, the burden of moral justification would seem to lie on **his** modern shoulders. Otherwise, we should brand and prosecute him as the thief he aspires to be.

Alan Reynolds
Associate Editor
National Review

To the Editor:

I just read your editorial in the May issue of *The Alternative* and I didn't like the part about the "noble red men." You say, "look what we have done for the American Indian." I know that time changes lots of things - but I believe there is one fact in history which remains the same **WHO WAS HERE FIRST?** Us or the "noble red man?" If memory serves me right I believe **he** was. Probably tied up the boat when **our** ancestors stepped off the Mayflower.

But the great white man fought them and took the land away from them and put them on a little patch of land, gave them a few blankets and food and **ordered** them not to stray out of bounds. That's Americanism and Christianity? (**Sic**) Well, I'm not too proud of it. You also say "our government" is it not "their" government, too? Don't they have a right to go to Senate hearings if they so choose? And you say "no civilized man" times have changed, Mr. Tyrrell, they're civilized maybe more than **you**. In my opinion, you sound like an "I" man. What makes you think you are any better than they are? They're just not **our** kind, right?

And while we're at it I suppose you believe the American Negroes should also be put on a reservation. And how did they get here? Did not the great white man bring them here for slaves? Naturally, they multiplied as most species

of human life does (**Sic**). And I say **HURRAH** for Abraham Lincoln - he was a great and wise man. In my opinion, the **greatest** President this nation has ever had or ever will have. Let's also put **Catholics** and **Jews** on reservations. They're not our kind, either. Have we left anyone out? Personally, I do believe that all men (and women) are created equal and should be treated as equals. I have never known any full-blooded Indians - but I did work with a girl that was part Indian - I believe her grandmother was a "half-breed" as you would probably say. I liked her and we got along just fine. I didn't feel I was better than she was. One of my **best** friends is a **Catholic** - I don't believe in her religion, but I respect her right to her own beliefs no matter how odd. I have worked with some very wonderful Negroes men and women. Some of my favorite entertainers are Negroes.

I'm proud to say I'm not prejudiced against Indians, Negroes, Catholics, Jews or whatever I'm just prejudiced against people who are prejudiced!!

Penelope Penberthy
Bloomington, Indiana

To the Editor:

I admire John R. Coyne, Jr., and thus I was greatly disappointed in his **Centrist Nixon, Centrist Nation** piece in your May *Alternative*.

First, for reasons articulately offered by George McCarter in the same issue and by Evans and Novak in their book, Richard Nixon is not a "centrist." That is, he is not a product of nor conscious espouser for the broad, middle base of non-ideological citizens which make up our country. He has always been an introvert by nature, we are told by his intimates, and his few associates were men of non-descript though hyperambitious character with equal desires to achieve success. The President is a card-carrying Pragmatist.

Secondly, by asking if we, as conservatives, "really (would) enjoy living in a completely conservative society?", John Coyne perhaps unconsciously assumes that conservatism is an ideology. Though some people by the rigor of their "conservative demonstration" may facilitate such appearances, I join the late Willmoore Kendall in his nearly universally held view. That is, that there is a reason no one has ever written or attempted to write a book entitled, **Conservatism, A to Z**. As philosophical and/or political conservatives, our views are "in continuing approximation." Dr. Jeffrey Hart offers proofs in his, *The American Dissent* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), and one only has to read a single issue of *National Review* to realize that there is no party line amongst us. In his heart, I know that John Coyne agrees with me, because the day American conservatism loses its basically eclectic and - fusionist character (i.e., the day we deny American pluralism) is the day we join the fate of moribund Liberalism.

Thirdly, assuming the President is a pragmatic fellow, I also assume he acknowledges a momentary truth, though a truth no less: One can get away with moves to the left (e.g., FAP, wage-price, China, low profile on defense, etc.) that one cannot effect with impunity to the right. (e.g. attempt in 1969 to decrease size of state department). By pulling off a China reverse and pleasing at least most editors of the *New Republic* with FAP, the President gains marginal political support in certain communities not accessible to a normal Republican. The Silent Majority, which increasingly describes itself as conservative as time evolves, is satisfied with Nixon stands and-or moves on busing, abortion and areas of material interest. The Silent Majority has never been an avid follower of foreign affairs, nor will it unless it directly involves American boys or an attack on American soil. The Silent Majority, the visceral base of

"grassroots conservatism" sociologists are discussing more frequently these days, depends on the Barry Goldwaters, the Ronald Reagans and the identified public office holders to describe the "conservative's position" on China, Vietnam, etc.

The danger in Conservative support of Nixon and the danger of not articulating a position to the right of this antiprincipled administration would not have been real had our political leaders, Governor Reagan and Senator Goldwater, offered a spirited to at least luke-warm opposition during those days of the week Nixon is Liberal. However, by omission, established senior conservative leaders in effect confirmed the media's portrait of Nixon as the Conservative Alternative. And so it is that a pragmatic president, described today as a "centrist," can tomorrow move thirty degrees to the left and still be called a "centrist." Or so it will be unless a few more established conservative leaders offer the nation a little more choice and a bit less echo on behalf of Nixon's right flank in the years ahead.

Ronald F. Docksai
national chairman,
Young Americans for Freedom

To the Editor:

Why exactly David Brudnoy takes upon himself the task of reviewing a book, the contents of which and subject whereof he confesses some ignorance, is a question which I should think at least a few other readers may have asked. Several of his open-ended sentences and paragraphs could stand reply and clarification. First, he is wrong to judge today's theatre on the basis of flying genitalia. "Dionysus in 69," and "Fortune and Men's Eyes," the implicit suggestion in his review-article being that such like are representative of all modern theatre productions. They may be representative of a theatrical sexual preoccupation, but probably not much more. Sure, "Hair" was highly profitable in Boston (and elsewhere) while it ran, but "Jacques Brel" and "The Proposition" too, have been just as profitable and popular in their own ways. And for each college production of "Fortune and Men's Eyes" he points to, I'll bet he can also point to a traditional play in a seasonal program, for my guess is that a collegiate company cannot hope to attract a sizeable audience throughout its season if it insists on toasting the **avant-garde** is bound to be artificial. People just can't be homogenized like that, especially as concerns the theatre. I've seen some Shakespearean productions which Mr. Brudnoy would have found just as dismaying as anything done by the Living Theater. On the other hand, Robert Bolt's "Vivat, Regina" is, by all standards, theatrically conservative. Anyone who frequents the theatre is bound to be sophisticated in his own way, and educated, even if superficially, to the kinds of changes the twentieth century has wrought in drama. Those who were weaned on Pirandello in the thirties can hardly be called "new theatre-goers" today.

And, third, if I may be forgiven for suggesting the matter, it does seem to me as if Mr. Brudnoy may be confusing the **avant-garde** with modern drama. Though it is true that one arises from the other, the two aren't always the same. To use an example from a form of entertainment he knows well, Robbe-Grillet's "L'Eden et apres" is **avant-garde** and would have been impossible without the Dali-Bunuel "Un Chien Andalou," but there's little point in calling the latter **avant-garde**. It's now part of the classical cinematic repertory.

Your humble servant,
Steve Finer
Boston, Massachusetts

corridor and then went into a seminar room.

By this time, the SDS and UAG members who had been in the elevator with Mr. Herrnstein were rejoined by the other members of their group, and together they entered and then quickly left the seminar room in which Mr. Herrnstein was located. Paul Goodof appeared and told the group he was a representative of Charles P. Whitlock, Dean of Harvard College. Mr. Goodof stood in front of the door of the seminar room, and the confrontation ended. (My account of these events is taken from Daniel Swanson's article "Herrnstein Baited; May Call in CRR" in *The Harvard Crimson*, March 7, 1972. By the way, I have neither seen nor heard a single report that anyone on the Harvard campus who witnessed these events — with the exception of Mr. Goodof — attempted to aid Mr. Herrnstein or the police officer.)

After these events were over, Mr. Herrnstein said he might report them to the Committee on Rights and Responsibilities (CRR), which is Harvard's disciplinary committee. Eventually, Mr. Herrnstein filed charges against two people: Bonnie Blustein, a senior at Radcliffe, and Alan J. Garfinkel, a fourth-year graduate student in philosophy to whom I already have referred. Both Miss Blustein and Mr. Garfinkel have been prominent in radical activities at Harvard; both have been leaders of the anti-Herrnstein campaign there; and both were members of the SDS-UAG group that harassed Mr. Herrnstein on March 6.

The eight-member CRR took testimony, received evidence and heard arguments from both sides of the two cases and then, after meeting five times for a total of sixteen hours over three weeks, it recently announced its decision to take no action against Miss Blustein or Mr. Garfinkel.

That should not be too surprising. Anyone who has observed the establishment of these "new era" disciplinary committees knows what to expect from them and it's not committees for academic freedom.

Thus it is both instructive and useful to discuss what the CRR and similar institutions at other colleges and universities represent. The politicization of American colleges and universities has included the adoption by many students, teachers and administrators of political conceptions of the university. Some of these students, teachers and administrators, particularly political radicals, conceive of the university as a center for the propagation of certain political values and a base for certain political activities (the values propagated and the activities undertaken being determined by whoever controls the university). The political radicals do not want to change the nature of the university as they understand it; what they want is to control the university

so that they can determine what values it propagates and what activities it undertakes. But I believe most of the students, teachers and administrators who hold political notions about the university conceive of it not as a center for the propagation of certain political values and a base for certain political activities but rather as a democratic polity. (For a critical analysis of the analogy between universities and democratic politics, see Robert Brustein's *Revolution As Theatre*, reviewed in *The Alternative*, May 1971.)

According to the conception of the university as a democratic polity, students, teachers and administrators are not members of a hierarchical community of scholars but free and equal citizens of a democratic community. They enjoy not the "privileges" of people who have successfully competed for a limited number of places in a hierarchical community of scholars but the "rights" of citizens of a democratic community. One such "right" is to participate in decision-

making, for example, by voting or by sitting on councils. Students, teachers and administrators who want to see this "right" realized work to make the institutions of the university correspond as closely as possible to those of a democratic state.

Harvard's Committee on Rights and Responsibilities is typical. The faculty members who sit on it are elected by their "constituency," the entire Faculty of Arts and Sciences, from among faculty members nominated by the Faculty Council (which itself is elected by the entire faculty) or by individual faculty members. The several student "constituencies" under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences — freshman, upperclassmen and graduate students — may elect representatives with full voting power to the CRR but they have refused to do so because, among other reasons, they do not have representation on the CRR equal to or greater than that of the faculty. Since these students conceive of the university as a democratic polity, they think it is unjust for a

Enlighten Your Friends Annoy Your Enemies

Free Magnifying Glass for Donors of Gift Subscriptions!

Now those who wish to purchase gift subscriptions to *The Alternative* for their friends or even for their enemies can obtain a free magnifying glass. The magnifying glass—an indispensable instrument for doctors, lawyers, students, housewives, clerics and others—has over 1001 uses. Use it to read fine print. Keep it handy by your dictionary, Bible or evening newspaper. Use it to inspect pores in your skin or interesting moles. Also useful in pollution control and other movement activities.

Just fill out this handy order blank and send it to **Free Magnifying Glass, c/o The Alternative, R.R. 11 Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.**

Enclosed is \$forone-year gift subscriptions to *The Alternative* (\$2.00 for students and faculty, \$4.00 for others). I understand one or more gift subscriptions entitles me to a free magnifying glass.

☐ Thanks, please send the gift subscriptions but don't send me the free magnifying glass.

My Name and Address

☐ Yes, please rush my free magnifying glass today. Enclosed is an extra \$5.00 which I understand goes for postage and handling.

Gift for	Gift for
Address	Address
.....ZipZip
College or Univ.	College or Univ.

"minority" (the faculty) to have more representatives than the "majority" (them).

The CRR is authorized to receive complaints from members of the University Community. If the members of the CRR believe the complaints should be considered, they may decide to hold "hearings" on them. At hearings, "plaintiffs," "defendants" and their "witnesses" present "evidence," give "testimony" and make "arguments." When the hearings are over, the CRR's members hold "deliberations," out of which come "decisions" on whether or not the defendants are "guilty" and what, if any, penalties are to be imposed. Few defendants who are found guilty are expelled from the University, perhaps because, given the conception of the university as a democratic polity, expulsion seems equivalent to life imprisonment or even the death penalty. (If you think this is ridiculous, you have not spent much time at an American university recently; if you were to have done so, you would have cultivated an appreciation of the ridiculous.)

In both the way its members are selected and the way its business is conducted, the CRR is an institutional expression of the conception of the university as a democratic polity. It is modelled on a court in a democratic state. But it does not have all the characteristics of such a court and it does not function as part of a complete judicial or legal system. If any people are selected by either "plaintiffs" or "defendants" to represent them before the CRR, such people are not "officers of the court." This "court" has no "officers," including police officers (the duties of the Harvard University Police essentially are those of watchmen). The members of the CRR are not full-time "judges"; they are not even lawyers. Even if they were lawyers, they probably would not be much better equipped to do their work, for they have no "laws" to uphold and no substantial body of "precedents" to consult. They can turn only to a "Resolution on Rights and Responsibilities" and their own decisions over the past few years. So, for the most part, the CRR's members must make decisions largely on the basis of whatever standards happen to seem appropriate to them when cases arise, and this *ad hoc* procedure understandably has moved some people to criticize the CRR for being unfair or unjust.

There may be people who recognize the defects of panels like the CRR but believe these defects can be eliminated by making these panels more like courts in a democratic state. These people also may feel it is "better" that disciplinary decisions be made by such panels, whatever their defects, than by a group of administrators or — heaven forbid — one administrator. But why is it "better?" There is nothing that indicates the CRR, with its largely *ad hoc* procedure, is less arbitrary than an administrator. There

is, however, evidence that suggests the CRR is less effective and efficient and, therefore, less able to protect the University from danger.

Take Miss Blustein and Mr. Garfinkel. They repeatedly have demonstrated their hostility toward Harvard and their contempt for teaching, learning and scholarship in general and they recently have led a campaign of harassment and intimidation against one of Harvard's professors. As a result of their participation in one of the actions of that campaign, they were brought before a committee of eight Harvard professors. The subsequent spectacle of these eight professors meeting five times for sixteen hours over three weeks to agonize over the cases of these two students may strike some people as an example of fairness or justice. It strikes me as an exercise in fatuity. It is the result of a series of actions, including the establishment of the CRR itself, based on the conception of the university as a democratic polity. That conception is not necessarily "wrong" and the conception of the university as a hierarchical community of scholars is not necessarily "right," but these two conceptions are incompatible. A university cannot be a democratic polity and a hierarchical community of scholars. If Harvard or any other university wants to survive as such a community, it needs not more committees like the CRR but more people who have confidence in their own judgment that teaching, learning and scholarship are worthwhile and, therefore, worth defending. (In other words, it needs more people who believe in what Professor Robert Nisbet calls "the academic dogma," though that dogma has been increasingly abandoned under the attacks of recent years. See Professor Nisbet's brilliant book *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma*, reviewed in *The Alternative*, March 1972.)

Before people can have confidence in the judgment that teaching, learning and scholarship are worthwhile and worth defending, they must be able to make that judgment. Over this past academic year, there have been a few events that may at first suggest that at least some people at Harvard are able to make it. The campaign against Mr. Herrnstein has been deprecated and deplored by some 100 faculty members in a public statement, by students enrolled in Mr. Herrnstein's "Introduction to Psychology" course in a letter to *The Harvard Crimson*, and by Derek C. Bok, the President of Harvard, in remarks at a faculty meeting on April 11. Neither the faculty statement nor the student letter nor President Bok's remarks contain concrete proposals for stopping the harassment and intimidation of Mr. Herrnstein. So, although the statement, the letter and the remarks may be taken as well-intentioned, they also may be dismissed as instances of the moral grandstanding that flourishes on American campuses.

Mr. Bok made his remarks about the anti-Herrnstein campaign in the course of explaining to the faculty why his Administration had decided to let SDS hold its "National Convention Against Racism" at Harvard from March 30 to—April 2. He said there was "a heavy presumption against offering our facilities to certain groups and denying them to others because of our agreement or disagreement with their opinions and behavior."

From what sort of thinking does such a presumption emerge? It may be that Mr. Bok conceives of the university as a democratic polity and, consequently, believes that denying a group the privilege of using Harvard's facilities is in some sense equivalent to denying it the right of free speech. It also may be that Mr. Bok regards his refusal to consider the "opinions and behavior" of people when he decides how to treat them as a sign of his "liberalism," "openness" or "tolerance," but a refusal to discriminate and judge is a refusal to think.

When some people at a university harass intimidate a professor, they are not posing a challenge to an administrator's "liberalism," "openness" or "tolerance" or a disciplinary committee's "fairness" or "justice." What they are posing is a challenge to the courage, decency and good sense of everyone at the university. When some people at a university slander a professor, prevent or disrupt his public appearances and even physically attack him, they are not acting like scholars but like thugs.

Originally, the word "Thugs" designated members of a religious organization in India who killed and robbed in the name of Kali, a god of destruction. The Thugs were not common criminals; they were "idealists" who interpreted their crimes as religious acts. Other people interpreted their crimes differently and the Thugs were suppressed after 1831. The suppression of their descendants at American colleges and universities could not begin too soon.

Terry Krieger

Commentary

165 East 56th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10022

Commentary
AUTHENTICITY
& THE MODERN
UNCONSCIOUS
LOVE-TRIPPING

It sounds like a sane offer. So send me the current issue of *Commentary* free, and enter a subscription in my name—8

months more for just \$7. The free issue is mine to peruse for ten days. After that, I'll either pay your bill or send it back to you with the word "cancel" scrawled across it. Which, being sane people, you will accept without a wince.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____



"Whom the gods destroy they first make mad." — Euripides

THE TURTLE AND THE HARE-BRAINED

The distinguished senator from Massachusetts notes another clique of Robber Barons flagrante delecto: Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) warns that 95 per cent of all pet turtles shipped in the United States are contaminated with salmonella bacteria, although the turtle farmers claim a much lower number — 25 per cent.

—Cincinnati Enquirer

A NATION OF SOMNAMBULATING EINSTEINS

When the New Enlightenment filters down to a woman of the cloth merri-ment ensues.

Grades and class rankings are "in-human" ways of rating students and do more harm than good, two Mid-western educators told the North Central Accrediting Association meeting here yesterday.

Such evaluations lead to "injustices which students, teachers and principals can no longer countenance," said Sister Mary Simpson, principal of St. Teresa Academy in East St. Louis.

"Probably every secondary school principal here today has known an underachiever in the 9th and 10th grades who suddenly wakes up and wants desperately to attend engineering school, but his class rank places him below half in his class," she said.

—Chicago Tribune

BEYOND BUSING

What will the pointy heads be telling the little children next?

A small shopowner in the municipality of Caruaru in Northeast Brazil told authorities he had withdrawn his 8-year-old son from school because he had been told by his teacher that man had landed on the moon.

"Nowadays they teach things that haven't happened," said Severino Salvino da Silva, 45.

He said the space trip saga was "an invention of newspapers and professors who do not believe in God."

—UPI

NEWS TWISTERS AGAIN

Tsk Tsk, Agnew's assault on the media finds an unexpected ally:

Near-Neanderthal publisher, William Loeb, had insulted Mr. Muskie

—The New Republic

CORVAIRS AND SNAKE OIL

Ralph Nader's years of studying the scheming ways of big business have not been wasted. Recently a cunning advertisement actually signed by him appeared in the *New York Times* with this enterprising attachment. On to General Motors ...

Public Citizen, Inc.
P.O. Box 19404, Washington, DC.
20036

I am a Public Citizen. Here's my \$15.00 (I enclose an additional contribution of \$). Please don't waste any of it sending me a thank you letter, a membership card or literature. I know what's wrong. What I want is to see something done about it.

Name
Address
City
State
Zip

Please make check payable to:
Public Citizen, Inc.

WONDERS OF SCIENCE

From the newspaper advertisement of a renowned Midwestern chiropractor, one can easily perceive that this arcane science might soon render Dr. Spock obsolete as well as leeches and horse hairs:

Q. I read in a popular child care book that spanking a small child could be injurious to his spine, and that it might create serious problems in the future. I don't believe in beating a child but our little boy responds very nicely to a little swat on his behind. What is your opinion, doctor?

A. Please don't get me into the middle of the age-old controversy about sparing the rod or vice versa. Just let me tell you about the structure of your little boy's body.

Remember the song that goes, "knee bone connected to the thigh bone, thigh bone connected to the hip bone, hip bone connected to the back bone," etc. Every parent should keep that song in mind when punishing a child.

GNOSTIC STUDIES

Sister Annie Gottlieb peers into the future presumably after a tour of the Bronx zoo:

We are moving "beyond all known standards ... to a species with a new name, that would not dare define itself as a man."

—The New York Review of Books

THE ARTIST AS A YOUNG DOG

Signs that the cultural renaissance has seeped into the Dallas Cowboy' locker room as revealed in a rare and very special interview with Mr. Duane Thomas, running back:

"Art held me back — it being impossible to leave the world of football until I had brought forth all I had felt called upon to produce."

Promising a return to what he called "the highest perfection," he said he would again some day stir the same feelings in football crowds that Beethoven "Eroica" — or Heroic — Symphony evokes from music lovers.

—Associated Press

BELLES LETTRES

The multifarious capacities of the New China man continue to dazzle the decadent West. Compare this artful poem, written by Papa Mao, with any of the paltry poesy ever penned by old Adolph:

The Long March

The Red Army is not afraid of hardship on the march, the long march.

Ten thousand waters and a thousand mountains are nothing.

The Five Sierras meander like small waves,

The summits of Wumeng pour on the plain like balls of clay.

Cliffs under clouds are warm and washed below by the River Gold Sand.

Iron chains are cold, reaching over the Tatu River.

The far snows of minshan only make us happy

and when the army pushes through, we all laugh.

—New York Times

THE RED SCARE

It's dog eat dog in the exotic rough and tumble of U.N. literary circles:

Vallery Ivanovich Markelov a United Nations secretariat editor arrested Monday night on espionage charges, had extensive technical engineering training, records indicated yesterday.

Yesterday the 32-year-old stockily built Russian was held in \$5,000,000 bail by United States Magistrate Max Schiffman in Brooklyn.

Monday night's arrest took place in a parking lot after a reported meeting in the Wah Lum Chinese restaurant in Patchogue, L.I.