

1970

The Genesis of Antimilitarism on the College Campus: A Contemporary Case Study of Student Protest

Theodore T. Leber Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Leber, Theodore T. Jr. (1970) "The Genesis of Antimilitarism on the College Campus: A Contemporary Case Study of Student Protest," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 23 : No. 9 , Article 7.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol23/iss9/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

One of the most significant political phenomena of the 1960's has been the rise of student protest against the Vietnam war, the presence of ROTC on the college campus, the draft, and other military-related issues. This protest has focused national attention upon America's domestic problems and most certainly had a significant impact in the formulation of the Nixon Doctrine—also made it clear that any future conflicts outside of U.S. boundaries would have to be thoroughly explained and justified. Nevertheless, overreacting to the domestic scene without due consideration to our genuine international interests can only relegate the United States to a second-class power status.

THE GENESIS OF ANTIMILITARISM ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS: A CONTEMPORARY CASE STUDY OF STUDENT PROTEST

A research paper prepared

by

Lieutenant Commander Theodore T. Leber, Jr., U.S. Navy

School of Naval Command and Staff

I—INTRODUCTION

Yonth of the 1960's has demonstrated that it can no longer be taken for granted. To be sure, the majority of students on the college camps today are Xerox copies of those "silent generation" students once talked of so disparagingly; of more significance today is a noisy, determined minority challenging the very foundation of American society. At the university, student unrest has so engulfed activities that to make a decision—almost any decision—involving students is done with great peril, especially if no provision is made to include student participation.

This research paper is designed to provide an understanding of student protest on the college campus with particular emphasis on the antimilitarism in their protests. The phenomenon of student protest is put into perspective by first providing an overview of the student movement and by revealing the difficulties of stereotyping today's youth. This identification is important for it counters the widespread belief that this generation of youth is readying for a violent revolution. The demand most definitely is for rapid reform and recognition of legitimate grievances, but revolution is "the bag" of only a tiny minority. To provide a framework for

understanding youth and student protests, the root causes of student unrest are outlined with exploration limited to three important areas—the generation gap, university authoritarianism, and the radical New Left.

Much of the restless behavior and dissent exhibited by today's youth is directly related to the Vietnam war. The antimilitarism manifested by the students is indicative of their perception of the war as misguided and, in some cases, as immoral. Disillusionment first came from campus intellectuals after the war was escalated in 1965. These faculty-led antiwar protests provided student activists with the rhetoric they would repeat over and over in the coming years, e.g., "Communism is no threat . . . revolutionary movements must not be suppressed . . . United States policy is not committed to the values of liberty and social justice."

As more and more manpower was needed for the war, antidraft protests were organized, with resistance taking various forms: mass demonstrations at which draft cards were burned or collected for return to Selective Service offices; "escapes" across the border; sit-ins and violent confrontations at local Selective Service offices, and claiming conscientious objector status.

Anti-ROTC protests, likewise, were a manifestation of the activists' discontent with the war and their frustration at being unable to stop it. The New Left led the demand for expulsion of ROTC from campuses and attacked universities for complicity with the "imperialistic" government. (This paper will not examine the protests related to war-related research and recruiting on the campus, but it should be recognized that these protests also have been aimed at attacking the university for its "political" complicity.) Pressures are being exerted to reduce U.S. commitments overseas, to get the "military-industrial complex" under control, and to discredit the civilian and military leader-

ship involved in management of the Vietnam war.

II—OVERVIEW OF STUDENT MOVEMENT

Student concern about the central issues of American life dramatically unfolded during the 1960's. The explosive issues of civil rights and the Vietnam war have been compelling ones for idealistic youth and have been made to order for the small minority of radical students who respond to authority in a disruptive manner popularly called "confrontation politics." The general approach throughout this "Decade of Protest" has been to pick an issue—any issue—and confront the power structure with it as dramatically as possible. The ugly and disrespectful demands, as well as the deep and persistent ones, are backed up by campus-wide demonstrations, sometimes involving forms of destruction and violence. Such tactics test, exhaust, and disgust the authorities who have been labeled the "establishment."

But these harassment exercises should not obscure the facts. Even the hard-line president of San Francisco State College, Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, recognizes: "There is no question that many student demands are based on legitimate grievances, that some rules are outdated and stupid, that programs need to be modernized, that groups of citizens have been neglected." But he realistically warns that appeasement of student non-negotiable demands only teaches

. . . that demands backed by force or threat of violence will produce more and faster results than the exercise of reason. If this kind of capitulation to pressure continues we have nothing to look forward to in the years ahead but further defiance of authority and insurrection. . . . Change forced at gunpoint and disruption is no solution. It is an invitation to rule by terror.¹

60 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

The rejection of the status quo by the young people of the 1960's presents a vivid contrast to the young of the 1950's. The fifties was the decade during which McCarthyism was the most vital political movement in the United States. Liberalism, after two decades of exertion, had reached a point of exhaustion. The Socialist Party was a shell. And the cumulative blows of the Korean war, the Rosenbergs' conviction, the Smith Act trials, the Hungarian revolt, and the revelation about Stalin at the 20th Soviet Party Congress wrecked the Communist Party and its apparatus in the United States. By 1957 even the Labor Youth League, the Communist Party's youth arm, voted to dissolve.² The "silent generation" was indeed quiet on all fronts. However, to expect anything but silence from college students would have been unrealistic when the pressures of the McCarthy era also were keeping their elders silent. Besides, American youth has no true tradition of vanguard radicalism, and, unlike the youth of Latin America, Asia, and Europe, American youth had never been particularly political. There was no dramatic upsurge of youthful radicalism accompanying the Progressive movement, the Populists, the abolitionists, or the American Revolution itself.³ Nevertheless, by the end of the 1950's there were indications that the silence might soon be broken.

After reviewing the interests and complaints of college students of the late 1950's, sociologist David Riesman saw the beginnings of student unrest. Under the surface of silence he saw dissatisfaction, but almost no radicalism, and reported:

... the livelier students complain of the educational fare they are getting, of the very little contact the curriculum makes with the problems that are meaningful to them. Sometimes they feel that opportunities for a civilized and

intellectual life on campus are wanting—for example, that there are few inviting places to study or to talk, that social pressures in dormitories force any intellectual life out of the group setting, that student publications are either dominated by the school administration or devoted to campus news and trivia, that the bookstore is inadequate, or that the library is geared to meet research needs rather than to attract undergraduate browsers. They often feel that they have no access to the faculty for other than merely routine matters. Sometimes students complain about the prerequisites of a department, which serve its monopolistic aims or protect its mediocre teachers from boycott rather than serve any defensible pedagogic aims. Yet when I ask such students what they have done about these things, they are surprised at the very thought that they could do anything. They think I am joking when I suggest that if things came to worst, they could picket!⁴

The picketing was to come later, for the only real indication of dissatisfaction in the 1950's came from the subculture of the "beats." The beat generation withdrew from society, much like today's "hippies," instead of challenging and trying to change it. While the beats were rebelling against middle-class values, idealizing the Negro and going into voluntary poverty, the movement itself was apolitical and self-indulgent. Often called the rebels without a cause, the beats did have a monopoly because theirs was the only rebellion in town. But by the end of the 1950's the irreverent satire of Lenny Bruce and Mort Sahl began to poke at the conscience of the young. And there were the stirrings of S.A.N.E., local protests against segregation, and the

slow growth of dissident publications like *I. F. Stone's Weekly*, *The Village Voice*, and the *Realists*.⁵

No one can pinpoint the hour of student awakening as a movement. Some say it began when a University of California freshman went on a hunger strike to protest against compulsory ROTC in the autumn of 1959. Others say it began with the first lunch counter sit-in by Negro students in the South in February 1960 or with the anti-HUAC demonstrations on the steps of City Hall in San Francisco in May 1960. Perhaps it was even a reaction by those still in school who resented being called the "silent generation."

Connell Persico, a 22-year-old senior, takes former president of the University of California Clark Kerr to task for misreading the mood of the students: "How strange today sounds the statement written in 1959 by Clark Kerr . . . 'The employees will love this generation; they are not going to press many grievances. . . . They are going to be easy to handle. There aren't going to be any riots.'"⁶

The new mood of the Nation and certainly of the students was perhaps best perceived in 1959 by Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., who wrote in a prophetic essay "The New Mood in Politics":

At periodic moments in our history, our country has paused on the threshold of a new epoch in our national life, unable for a moment to open the door, but aware that it must advance if it is to preserve its national vitality and identity. One feels that we are approaching such a moment now. . . . The beginning of a new political epoch is like the breaking of a dam. Problems which have collected in the years of indifference, values which have suffered neglect, energies which have been denied employment—all suddenly tumble as in a hopeless

swirling flood onto an arid plain. . . .⁷

Of course Schlesinger was talking about the politics of John F. Kennedy, but its application to the campus mood cannot be denied. Kennedy's election seemed to have liberated energies bottled up for a decade. The Nation seemed to have a new vitality and a new political awareness. On the campus the dominant political note was at first for world peace and civil rights, but it appeared to be just a moral gesture of "witness" by a handful of students. At the core of these first peaceful demonstrations was a small group of students with a sophisticated political point of view. According to Michael Harrington:

Socialist clubs and students are more often than not at the heart of the student movement. Two main groups of students compose this organizational core. The Young Peoples' Socialist League (YPSL), the youth affiliate of the Socialist party, has fewer than 1,000 members. Still, its chapters and broad campus clubs probably constitute the largest organizational network of student liberals in the United States. The "Yipsels" played a major role in the Youth Marches for Integration and they are an important element in the growth of the Student Peace Union, a radical direct action group. [The Student Peace Union was the forerunner of today's militant Students for a Democratic Society.] The second major group is harder to define since it is not formally organized. It is made up of the sons and daughters of former Communist party members or Wallace-ites . . . [but] . . . the Communists themselves are a small, quite limited force in the youth movement.⁸

62 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

Harrington gave an early indication of the trouble that lay ahead:

Some recent commentators have written enlogics to the non-ideological character of the youth movement. Usually these writers are imposing their own disillusionment upon a movement which they see from a great distance. To be sure, the broad mass of involved students are not ideologically committed, but their impetus usually comes from conscious radicals. . . .⁹

And this has remained the case throughout the 1960's. However, the handful of students active as political critics in the early sixties grew to much greater proportions as each year passed. At the same time, students began to question the rule-based authority of the colleges. Although colleges had long been *in loco parentis*, a growing number of students, guided by some faculty members, began criticizing specific rules. As the conflict between students and administration revealed the inner workings of the administrative process, the issues presented became more general and all-encompassing. Eventually, the very base of consent eroded to the point at which the entire pattern of authority seemed illegitimate to the activist section of the student body. During recent years, attacks on administrative bias, inconsistency, the lack of due process, and the restrictiveness of the policy of political neutrality amounted to a full-scale challenge to the legitimacy of university authority. The only elements missing were a demand for formal participation of students in the formulation and implementation of the rules and the mobilization of students to press that demand. All this was to come.

Perhaps the greatest symbolic event in the student protest movement occurred in February 1960 when four Negro students went to a lunch counter

in Greensboro, N.C. This act of non-violent civil disobedience sparked sympathetic student protest throughout the Nation. It was an issue with which students identified, for it was one "where moral right and wrong stand out most clearly."¹⁰

The students gave supporting action to this issue; some white students spent their summers in the countries of the Black Belt or in protest at the lunch counters of northern cities. Those who spent time in the South came back to their campuses only to recognize that "the student 'underclass' was as manipulated and mauled, as ignored and disqualified by the 'leaders' of the education establishment as the poor southern Negroes were discounted by the White 'leaders.'"¹¹ What did the white students in the civil rights movement want? They wanted the same thing that Negroes themselves wanted: "... simply an end to segregation and discrimination. All their talk was of 'desegregation' and all they asked was that the process begin on a basic level that everyone could understand. . . ."¹²

The issue that sparked the free speech movement at Berkeley in 1964 was a ban on on-campus recruiting for civil rights and other political activities. Students like Mario Savio had come back from the Mississippi summer organizing project committed to the fight for black liberation. When Savio was stopped, the students at Berkeley took the first firm stand against a university, and the national press discovered something called the "New Left."¹³ When four student leaders had disciplinary charges filed against them for their attempt to eliminate university restrictions against on-campus political activities, a mass sit-in at Sproul Hall occurred, resulting in 814 arrests¹⁴ but also in the lifting of the ban against political activities. Protest had proved a successful tactic, and the mass media quickly passed the word. Savio, who became the first of the national student

political heroes, estimated that more than 10 percent of the student body, or about 3,000 students, at Berkeley had taken direct part in civil rights activity in the South or in the San Francisco Bay area by fall of 1964. They had at least walked in a picket line, but "a great many can be said to have participated vicariously."¹⁵ This then was the coming of age of student protest. From peaceful sit-ins in 1964, protest escalated to mass marches and strikes and violent confrontations by 1969.

Some observers say that

youth is what youth has always been, eager for fine interpretation of life, capable of splendid resolves, but it comes up out of its childhood today into a world of ruthless exposures and cynical pretensions. The past 10 years have seen the shy and powerful idealism of youth at a loss and dismayed as perhaps it has never been before.¹⁶

This was the impression of youth by a student—in 1928. That the thought still applies suggests that the problems of youth today are not unique. Professor Jacques Barzun, former provost at Columbia University, believes that any discussion of students who rebel against the university as it is today can easily wind up as a postmortem on Western civilization: "They [students] share, to begin with, the common experience of being young men. This fact implies that turbulence is to be expected. . . . Students at universities have always been violent . . . [but] . . . the impression of disorder probably conceals, as it does today, the behavior of the majority."¹⁷

Barzun also believes that today's youth can be compared with an observation about youth made in 1945 by Gertrude Stein:

One of the things that is most striking about the young genera-

tion is that they never talk about their own future, there are no futures for this generation, not any of them, and so naturally they never think of them. It is very striking, they do not live in the present, they just live, as well as they can, and they do not plan.¹⁸

However, such comparisons are not too convincing when one sees a large percentage of the students actively calling for peace, civil rights, relevance in their education, and an opportunity to effectively participate in the decisions that rule their lives. And it does not recognize that students are making what traditionalists might call remarkable headway. There is a definite pattern of belated acknowledgment of the reasonableness of many student demands. Students protest injustices, and after much turmoil, dissension, and sometimes violence the university admits that some wrongs did, in fact, exist. Moreover, there is evidence that the wrongs would have continued to exist uncorrected if the activists, like the child in "The Emperor's New Clothes," had not insisted: "But the emperor is naked."¹⁹

Dr. Roger W. Heyns, chancellor at the University of California at Berkeley, provides a viewpoint of students which needs careful consideration for it comes closest to "telling it like it is" for the majority of students:

The frustration that is overwhelming to American college youth is that they cannot understand why this Nation, with unlimited resources and ability as they see it, seems to place such little priority on realization of the "American Dream." The frustration is compounded when these same youngsters—wanting to remind their elders of the "Dream" and to demonstrate

their personal concern—are branded as troublemakers, dissidents and some sort of evil force that has to be controlled. . . . The students are frustrated by the “war” in Vietnam, the desire to end racial and social injustice, the motivation to eliminate poverty, the disenchantment with educational institutions which seem to be aloof . . . [and there is] an overwhelming desire to be heard and listened to by those who are older and who are making decisions which affect young lives.²⁰

When asked to rate the present college generation, Dr. Heyns told a U.S. Senate subcommittee in July 1969:

I would rate them very highly on a number of important attributes. They are very well prepared. They are bright. They pursue their academic activities with great seriousness. I think one of the things that characterizes them in contrast to many preceding generations is their involvement and concern about broad social issues, much greater than anything I have experienced in previous generations.²¹

This characterization, coming from the top man at one of the largest and most activist-prone universities in the United States, supports the observations of most scholars of the contemporary student scene that today’s youth is not a mass of misfits whose only goal is to destroy. However, to deny out-of-hand the validity of many of the students’ grievances would only foster further frustration and revolt and would propel large numbers of students into the radical camp.

A 1969 *Fortune* nationwide survey reported that at least 40 percent of American university students are dissatisfied with the careers offered them

in American society and are intent on seeking a life combining moral purpose with the pursuit of a livelihood. The label of “lozerrunners” has been given to this group because their attitudes are reflective of a lack of concern about making a great deal of money.²² On the assumption that our society will grow even more affluent, the attitudes of these young people, if retained after joining the adult world, appear to be of great significance. If these students do become liberated from the concerns of material success, they will be free to do more than merely express the moral idealism that has traditionally been associated with youth, and dramatic change will be demanded. *Fortune’s* study also indicates that about two-thirds of the students believed it appropriate to engage in civil disobedience to further causes they support, and about 10 percent said they would support civil disobedience no matter what issues were involved.²³ This study suggests that behind a small and highly visible activist minority is a much larger but generally invisible majority holding similar attitudes which remain a potential for widespread commitment for issues perceived as vital.

A study by the Roper Public Opinion Research Center reinforces the *Fortune* findings. Roper’s poll shows that while only 4.1 percent of the students strongly agree with the goals and objectives of the militant Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), almost 61 percent agree with some of their goals and objectives. Only 23 percent of the students polled said they strongly disagree with the goals and objectives of SDS.²⁴

These figures, however, should not lead one to the conclusion that all college campuses are teeming with dissent, protest, and revolt, for studies do not bear this out. But a controversy does rage between those observers who see American youth as wild and irresponsible and those who see only the deferential and conformist side of

youth. According to Keniston, the problem seems to be that the observers are usually looking at two sides of the same people, mistaking the part they see for the whole. Such an oversimplification is hard to avoid because "young people present one and now another face."²⁵

Barzun indicates just how difficult it is to classify students.

The young do not present a single front to the institutions they attend and attack. Some riot, a few protest, but the great majority pass by. . . . No classification is even plausible: "beatnik" and "hippie" are useless terms, quickly outworn and not indicative of opinion and behavior. Some want peace, others drugs; some grow long hair, others spout obscenity. Still others would destroy everything in sight if they dared. . . . The Vietnam war adds its chaos of emotions to the confusion of social and individual resentments and all that emerges is an unrest which its most articulate creators declare to be without a program.²⁶

The Urban Research Corporation study "Student Protest 1969 Summary" sheds more light on the extent of current student protest. During the first 6 months of 1969, 232 of the nation's 2,377 colleges and universities experienced a protest. Protest was defined in this study as an organized attempt by a student group to (1) stage a disruption of college activities or (2) make a formal set of demands of a college or university. During this period, protests occurred on only 9.8 percent of the campuses with only about 250,000 students actively involved. Inasmuch as there were about 7,000,000 college students in 1969, the activists are indeed a small percentage of the total student population.²⁷

No one denies, however, that this

small percentage can and does make university life far different from previous years when scholars could go about their business ignoring the antics of the students.

A former president of the National Union of Students indicates that the small but vocal groups which have been popularized by the mass media have been attempting to portray the passing issues as symptomatic of a wider class war. However, these groups, he says, have had little or no impact on the vast majority of participants who are stirred up far more by the issues involved but who remain "determinedly concerned with its educational—not political—significance. The basic feelings which spark off unrest are normally a sense of outrage when college authorities offend not Marxist tenets but what students see as fundamental and humanitarian liberties."²⁸

Finally, a professor of history at Berkeley who has studied the student movement divides the college "vast" majority of students into two groups:

The vaster and more silent consists of vocational students. Most engineers, many students of applied and some of pure science (although probably not most law students or members of the School of Social Welfare) belong to this category and take no part in campus political controversy. . . . The other large group, made up mostly of graduate and undergraduate students in the liberal arts, consists of those who are to one degree or another disaffected. The number is hard to estimate. . . . These are the "youth of today" about whom so much is written. They find little to encourage them in the America of Nixon and Reagan, they detest the Vietnam war (and as a result cannot listen to any defense of American foreign policy); they

believe passionately in personal freedom and approve, whether or not they participate in, such demonstrations of it as smoking marijuana, dressing unconventionally and being open about one's sex life. . . . They have a quick eye and ear for the phony and in the long run, despite their belief in emotion and its expression, respect intellectual honesty. They can be triggered into political action quickly, but only by issues or symbols that appeal to their deepest feelings. These feelings are not primarily political but are concerned with relations among individuals.²⁹

III—CAUSES OF STUDENT UNREST

Efforts to identify the root causes of student unrest, activism, and alienation have occupied much attention during recent years. There is no dearth of explanations. Some seem to be based only on opinions which support the prejudices of differing political viewpoints; others are presented with greater analytic objectivity. However, no hypothesis thus far advanced is considered sufficient in and of itself to explain student unrest. At best, each is only a partial explanation, shedding only a small light on a highly complex phenomenon. The most often mentioned root causes of student unrest today include the following: a permissive upbringing of children in liberal-democratic homes; the constant pressures placed upon youth to succeed through higher education, brought about by the needs of the postspntnik and postindustrial era; the absence of economic and moral responsibility in an affluent and psychologized society; the unique university environment where peer group relationships are considered vital by the student in his quest for identity; the disproportional amount of publicity given to student activists and hippies by

the mass media; the "oppressive" government's actions, or inactions, in the case of civil rights, the cold war, the Vietnam war, the war on poverty, and the quality of life; and, finally, the massive growth and potential growth of technology, making today's knowledge, today's work skills, and today's values irrelevant in tomorrow's world.

This listing emphasizes the diversity of explanations of student unrest and undoubtedly will be expanded as researchers delve into the subject more thoroughly in the years to come. Moreover, the study of these explanations demonstrates the futility of searching for simple answers. The subject of student unrest is too complex for that.

For the purposes of this paper, three additional causal areas for unrest are explored—the generation gap, university authoritarianism, and the New Left. These areas provide readymade controversy, and full agreement by those closest to the students has not been reached. However, a framework for understanding youth in protest can be built by examining these areas.

Generation Gap. One of the commonly held causes for student unrest in the 1960's has been that there is a generation gap. Some observers place major emphasis on the permissive upbringing of the college students of today, others stress the Oedipal rebellion complex, while still others indicate the gap is due to a rapidly changing society which does not enable students to see the future with any certainty. Moral issues also are considered a prime reason for the generational conflicts.

John W. Aldridge, who propounds the permissiveness theory, says:

We gave them a world which seemed to be designed exclusively for their pleasure and comfort and yet which was impoverished in nearly all the resources necessary for the humane life, the adven-

turous life, the life of feeling and the life of thought. . . . As we grew in affluence and became more permissive in an effort to atone for their steadily increasing estrangement from us, we bribed them with money to buy cars, clothes, popular records—the accessories of a purely materialistic, endlessly diversionary existence.¹

This emphasis on providing effortless material comfort seems to be a logical outgrowth of an older generation which was well aware of depression and World War sacrifices. Thus, today's young people were raised in a moral culture geared around taking material measures to eradicate material difficulties.

Psychologists Jeanne Block, Norman Haas, and M. Brewster reported after reviewing two surveys of student activists:

Many young activists in contemporary America were reared under the influence of Benjamin Spock who, as an articulate pediatrician, led a revolt against the more authoritarian, rigid, constrained child-rearing practices. . . . It may be argued that the emergence of a dedicated, spontaneous generation concerned with humanitarian values and personal authenticity is a triumph of Spockian philosophy and principles. Others have suggested in a less benign interpretation, that activism is the consequence of "excessive" parental permissiveness, a failure to teach respect for authority, and an unfortunate submission to the needs and feelings of the child.²

If these findings are correct, can there be much wonder over the tactics we see on the college campuses today?

It would appear that the students have

learned their lessons well within the family and are now using the same techniques. If youth's authority was never opposed by their parents, the anger and rebellion which should have been tested during childhood will finally find an outlet when resistance is first offered on the campus. Furthermore, it appears possible that because of youth's permissive upbringing they have very little sense of reality, no awareness of, or tolerance for, human limitation, and certainly no real understanding of the many obstacles which stand in the way of the kind of "instant" change which they demand.

Compounding the problem of a permissive upbringing, some writers explain youth's rebellion as a generational conflict in which the son attacks the authority of the father. Feuer, for example, says the son is making a valiant attempt at de-authorization.³ Bettelheim also offers the Oedipal rebellion thesis:

. . . while youth may still have some emotional and economic need for parents, most parents have little emotional need, and very few an economic one, for a youth striving to be free of its elders. It is because parents still have an emotional need for children, not for an independent youth, that they often show strenuous resistance when youth fights for its independence. It is also what makes them so critical of certain exaggerations or passing effects of youth's battle for self-realization. . . . It follows that whenever society is so organized that youth remains dependent on the older generation, because of the duration of the educational process or for other reasons, and this older generation is not ready to step aside economically, politically or emotionally, a psychological impasse is created which

may be aggravated by unsolved Oedipal conflicts.⁴

On the other hand, Bereday explains the generation gap as being based on the changes in the society. For example, youth born after World War II were born after the racial integration of the Armed Forces and after court victories in southern universities assured the admission of a future elite of Negro civil rights lawyers. The youth of today have no "feel" for the American dilemma of older generations raised in an age of harsher race divisions. And for those who lived through the age of Hitler and Stalin and the era of American abandonment of China to communism, the war in Vietnam appeared a logical link in a chain of efforts to contain Communist imperialist expansion.⁵ The new generation, however, defined Vietnam in terms which were opposite to certain basic American beliefs. Lipset sees the new generation of protesters as children of liberals and former radicals who simply accept the existence of a polycentric divided communism and hence do not perceive Vietnamese communism as an extension of Russian or Chinese power. He says: "The very failure of the powerful United States to quickly defeat its small poor Vietnamese opposition has been evidence to the protesters of the oppressive character of the war, of its being a war in which a foreign power seeks to impose its will by force over another people."⁶

However, Keniston sees moral issues at the heart of the student revolt. His conclusion is based on research conducted at the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco by psychologists Block, Haas, and Brewster:

Their research is especially conclusive in its analysis of the relationship between moral development and participation in student protest activities. Their study is built on the research into moral

development by Lawrence Kohlberg, who in essence distinguished three major stages of moral reasoning: *pre-conventional* (the individual egocentrically defines right and wrong in terms of what is good or pleasurable for him); *conventional* (the individual identifies right and wrong either with being a "good boy or a good girl" or with a more general concept of law and order—that is with existing community standards), and *post-conventional* (a stage which most individuals never reach, in which right and wrong are identified with the long-range good of the community or which such abstract personal principles as the sanctity of life, the categorical imperative or the Golden Rule.)⁷

Comparing large numbers of students who participated in protest activities with students who had not, the researchers found:

	<u>Post-conventional</u>	<u>Conventional</u>
Protesters	56%	34%
Nonprotesters	12%	85%

Keniston then suggests that what we are witnessing today is a phenomenon that can be called "youthful desocialization." Traditional roles, institutions, values and symbols are being critically scrutinized and often rejected, while new roles, institutions, values, and symbols more adequate to the modern world are desperately sought.⁸

Virtually every researcher on the subject of student protesters has concluded that activists tend to come from "democratic" homes. Their parents have encouraged them to speak up, therefore "they are inclined to cherish self-expression above self-control, compassion above tough mindedness, spontaneity and sincerity above caution and restraint."⁹

There is indeed a generation gap—and

it probably is based not on any one of the above factors, but rather on all of them. But it is not that youth simply are refusing to accept the values and institutions of their parents. What they are demanding is that society live up to the ideal of these values and institutions. The values are not really new, but the demand through mass protests for total commitment to them and for translating these moral assumptions into political realities—and doing it right “now”—is new. What youth has done is look around at its total environment—at society’s values—and said, “We are going to take these values seriously and you must too!”

Because there exists on the campuses today a large number of students who have been raised rather permissively, they appear only to be escalating the demands previously made within their own homes. The impact of rising expectations is not seen just in developing countries—it is also applicable to the youth whose parents have created in them an expectation of freedom. Therefore the notion of educational self-determination, of doing one’s own thing, is a perfectly logical outcome of a childhood experience in which few restrictions were placed. If the student enters the university convinced that whatever is required is wrong and that he has the right to change it to his liking, we can look forward to continuing protest activities. The tumult, controversy, and criticism that youth has brought to higher education today should alert us to understand the need for change, innovation, and reform. Society cannot be guided solely by concepts designed to perpetuate the status quo, comfortable as that might be. In addition, we must attempt to better understand the forces that lead intelligent, talented, and idealistic students to refuse, challenge, or revitalize the conventional wisdom.

Peculiarly enough, studies of the backgrounds of New Left activists do

not indicate that their participation in the movement truly represents an expression of generational conflict. They are much more often students with liberal parents who are actively pursuing the ideals of their parents. For example, sociologist Richard Flacks reports that in 1965, 16 percent of the fathers of a group of Chicago activists classified themselves as “socialists,” 50 percent checked “highly liberal,” and 30 percent “moderately liberal.” Not a single father saw himself as even a moderate conservative. Among a control group of the fathers of nonactivists, only 6 percent classified themselves as “socialists” or “highly liberal,” while 40 percent identified their politics as conservative. The differences were equally striking with respect to attitudes on specific issues: only 27 percent of the fathers of activists favored the bombing of North Vietnam as compared with 80 percent approval from fathers of nonactivists.¹⁰

Similar findings were made in a study of civil rights activists. Almost two-thirds reported that their parents supported their work in the civil rights summer programs in the South. About half felt that their participation would actually enhance their relationship with their parents. Only 5 percent of the volunteers reported that they did not get along with or were hostile toward their parents.¹¹

Bettelheim says that youth “is happiest when it feels it is fighting to reach goals that were conceived of but not realized by the generation before them. What the older generation then urgently wished for itself, but had to acknowledge as the hope of the future—this is the legacy of youth.”¹² Such a rationale is most appropriate for all levels of authority to understand. Lipservice to civil rights, human dignity, the elimination of poverty, et cetera, will not close the generation gap. Commitment by adults to these ideals will. Youth must be shown through deeds, not words, that the values and ideals of society are

being actively pursued. A reasoned, yet inspiring, example must be provided for young people. For if youth has not perceived society's plan of action, they should not be blamed for actively pointing out faults and failures.

A stanza from Bob Dylan's "It's All Right, Ma ('I'm Only Bleedin')" perhaps best tells the story of the generation gap:¹³

Although the masters make the rules
Of the wise men and the fools
I got nothing, Ma,
To live up to

Because, as Max Weber has observed, youth has a tendency to follow a "pure ethic of absolute ends" rather than an "ethic of responsibility," we should expect them to be idealistic and to see the flaws in any "system." It is when youth is separated from the institutions of society and has no responsibilities to them that youth most readily sees the gaps between ideals and reality. While one is a student, his capacity for identification with mankind or the oppressed or the poor and miserable is at a high point. By this time society has socialized him; he has been taught that the ideals of equality, efficiency, justice, and economic well-being are our highest values. Yet he sees poverty, racial discrimination, caste systems, social inequality, administrative and political corruption as gross violations of such lofty principles. Consequently, young people tend to support idealistic movements which take the ideologies or values of the adult world more seriously than does the adult world itself. Because the student has had little experience to harden him to the imperfections of society, he does not recognize any justification for the imperfections.¹⁴

Young people therefore need to become involved with the operation of institutions. They need to be put into the adult world, not kept from it. They need to be given responsibility, not

sheltered from it. It is not because society can buy youth off by giving them a voice that these steps should be taken; rather it is to give youth the realization that adulthood calls for complex and demanding tasks and that the hard decisions are never black or white and therefore require deliberate, reasoned, and intelligent thought.

A responsible voice in the university environment would be a good first step.

University Authoritarianism. One of the strongest complaints of the students is that they have no voice in the running of their university. Today there is a clear tendency for student leaders to question and challenge the existing structure of authoritarian controls. This is true not only of the militant New Left, but also of elected student body representatives. However, the students generally face a strong faculty and administration, many of whom believe that there is no virtue in, or commitment to, the democratic process within the halls of academia. The university is not a polity, they argue, and students are there to acquire skills and learn. Others maintain that while the Great Society is a democracy, this in no sense requires that the political structure of the university itself should be democratic.

During recent years, students have shown a marked introversion toward problems related to their immediate college role and status. Students' demands show that they have serious doubts about the "justice" of disciplinary systems, the content of syllabi, and their college's governmental structures.¹⁵ Students are often quoted as condemning the curriculum as "irrelevant;" e.g., many colleges today still give the freshman the sense of repeating what he had already learned in high school. And the specialized program outlined for the upperclassman suggests a faith in the traditional arrangements—jobs, professions, institutions—that the

young are impatient with. The students may think that there can be instant curriculum relevancy, but according to Barzun:

The belief that a curriculum can be devised and kept relevant to the present is an illusion: whose present, in the first place and relevant for how long? Students differ in tastes, knowledge and emotional orientation. What concerns (or excites) one four-year generation will bore the next, as anyone can verify by reference to popular music. And so it is with literature, politics and the current view of credo and crises.¹⁶

This notwithstanding, Barzun does recognize that the student feels he suffers from neglect because so often teaching is not the central concern of the university. The shift to research after 1945 has modified the university atmosphere to warrant the student impression of neglect, which is supported by the teaching profession's emphasis on "publish or perish." That universities have not recognized the decay in the teaching art and the contempt of specialist teachers for all but their own recruits has been a primary cause for mass discontent. Such discontent is ready made for agitational forces.¹⁷

This feeling that students are not the primary concern of universities is reflected by faculty members themselves. Due recognition, however, must be made for the size of the university when considering its "feeling" for the students. When a sample of the Berkeley faculty was asked recently, "What proportion of the faculty members here would you say are strongly interested in the academic problems of students?" Only a third answered "almost all" or "over half." If the faculty members themselves perceive that their college's prime interest is not for the student, we

should not be surprised when students demand more power and arrange mass protests in support of teachers who teach but are found unsuitable for tenure. At three selective small liberal arts colleges, faculty members saw each other's interests much differently than those at Berkeley. The sample taken at these schools showed that between 85 and 90 percent of the faculty felt there was a strong interest in the student's academic problems.¹⁸

For all the demands heard for student power, changes in university discipline and educational content, and non-conformity in social standards, a Harris poll in 1965 reported that 85 percent of the students nationwide declared themselves satisfied with college. Only 12 percent said they were dissatisfied.¹⁹ In 1964, in the midst of Berkeley's Free Speech Movement crisis, a survey showed 82 percent of the students to be "satisfied with courses, examinations, and professors" at the university. The degree of satisfaction had come down to 69 percent in 1968.²⁰ However, the University of California's efforts to involve students in educational reform have failed in the recent past. Only 13 students showed up to discuss educational reform with the new chancellor there, and few came to public sessions arranged by the special faculty committee on educational reform. Even the Free Speech Movement's successor, the Free Student Union, could not sustain a program aimed at campus issues and had to dissolve. Lipset hypothesizes that the student movement, at least at Berkeley, may be determined "to avoid collaboration with the educational 'establishment' at all costs."²¹

As noted previously, a study by the Urban Research Corporation shows that during the first half of 1969, 292 major student protests occurred on 232 college and university campuses, but only 15 percent of these protests concerned revision in grading systems and curriculum,²² which tends to reinforce Lipset's

observation of noncollaboration, although apathy should not be ruled out.

What are the chances of the students assuming a major role in university affairs? It would appear not good, if the demand is for equal power. But if the demand is for running their own lives, the picture is quite different. A study entitled "Faculty Characteristics and Faculty Influence on Students" done by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education of the University of California at Berkeley shows that two-thirds of 1,069 faculty members at six colleges and universities in three states favor giving students responsibilities for their own social regulations. If the concept of *in loco parentis* then appears to be a dead issue as far as most faculty members are concerned, student participation in setting academic policies will come much harder. Only 19 percent of those polled were willing to grant students an equal vote with the faculty, while 60 percent said students should have some voice in academic matters, either through consultation or nonvoting committee membership.²³

There are some who will strongly defend the status quo. Former Columbia University Dean Herbert Deane once stated: "A university is definitely not a democratic institution. When decisions begin to be made democratically here, I will not be here any longer . . . Whether students vote 'yes' or 'no' on an issue is like telling me they like strawberries."²⁴ Barzun agrees with Deane and warns that the university can develop into a little totalitarian state under the dictatorship of the students abetted by those faculty members whose politics jibe with theirs.²⁵

But such positions miss the point. Certainly students cannot vote on every aspect of running a university, but they can be involved in the direction a university is going; they can be made responsible for some student activities, e.g., student newspapers, student unions, and student government, in-

cluding the allocation of monies for their programs. And they can sit on consultation boards and be represented on joint committees. To keep students from participating constructively will be a mistake. On the other hand, students do not have the professional competence to have a voice in every decision, and they should not be placated to avoid confrontations. What every university must do is review its policies, making sure they are just and proper. When review boards find rules that are no longer applicable or that need change, revisions should be made immediately. But where the board's best judgment determines that a rule remain, the line should be drawn, the rationale for the decision made clear, and the students told to comply. If disruptive protest follows, students should be given a hearing and suspended if suspension will best serve the university community.

Theodore Newcomb, of the University of Michigan, takes a most reasonable and enlightened stand regarding student participation:

I learned (as did most board members I think) that the first step toward solution was our acceptance of the possibility that the student grievances were worthy of serious consideration. If, as we had assumed, there were really insurmountable obstacles to the granting of their demands, informed students would be capable of understanding them. If, as they had assumed, our unnecessary recalcitrance was part of the insurmountability, then we, the board, were capable of understanding that.²⁶

Of a more disturbing nature for many universities are the present generation's political interests. The recent disorders have been centered around issues generally considered to be outside the

authority of the university. Students are opposed to the Vietnam war, they are suspicious of American foreign policy, they are critical of racism. And, most importantly, they claim that the university is not playing a progressive role or expressing a critical political viewpoint. Student protests, then, have been directed against racism and militarism and against university entanglements which appear to support such forces. If universities do not justify their positions relative to their cooperation with such organizations as the Department of Defense, the CIA, and weapons industries, protest will surely continue. Whether a university backs out of such arrangements because it fears the violent confrontations of which students are so capable these days or does so because it sees these arrangements as improper will be the critical test. If students are allowed to cast the deciding vote through emotional demonstrations rather than through reasoned arguments which consider the entire range of national interests, it is a good guess that students will call the shots and keep the university on the run. For there are elements on the campus with the sole intention of bringing down society; there is a tiny minority that wants a coup d'état.

The New Left. A major factor in the student movement and a root cause for student unrest has been the New Left. When it began in the late fifties and early sixties, the movement was described as left-liberal, and most of its adherents showed considerable optimism that American society could be reformed. But as each year has passed, the movement has consistently shifted leftward in its politics to the point where its members now openly seek to destroy America.

Although the New Left is a minority group, perhaps only 2 percent of the student body, the political protests which it sponsors often involve between

10 and 20 percent of the students. The overwhelming majority of American college students are not involved in New Left activities and still can be classified as politically apathetic—"caught up in their vocational, academic or hedonistic pursuits."²⁷ Nevertheless, the small group of alienated radicals composing the New Left has been able to effectively mobilize student action when its causes were closely tied to the students' current interest.

The forerunner of the more popularly known Students for a Democratic Society was the Student Peace Union, formed in 1959 and the first nationwide political association of a student character. The Student Peace Union's statement of purpose proclaimed:

This is an organization of young people who believe that neither war nor the threat of war can any longer be successfully used to settle international disputes and that neither human freedom nor the human race can long survive in a world committed to militarism. Without committing any member to a precise statement of policy, the SPU draws together young people for a study of alternatives to war and engages in education and action to end the present Arms Race. The SPU works toward a society which will ensure both peace and freedom and which will suffer no individual or group to be exploited by another.²⁸

Peace and nuclear testing held the primary political attention of the liberals on the northern campuses during this time. The apex was reached in February 1962 when SPU and Harvard's Toesin Club brought some 3,000 students to Washington, D.C., for a peace march. However, when the test ban was achieved in 1963, student attention turned away from peace and moved

74 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

toward civil rights and later toward the needs of the poor in general.²⁹ R. E. Peterson notes,

The student left is viewed as a movement that has emerged in the past seven or eight years on the basis of a shared rejection of many prevailing American institutions, a vaguely democratic-socialist political ideology, a faith in participatory democracy and a commitment to direct social action. While the student left has grown out of an amalgam of shifting civil rights, peace, and anti-poverty sentiments and activities, its ultimate goal is radical reform of American society and the characteristic nature of human roles and relationships on which it rests.³⁰

This point cannot be overemphasized, for while the ideals which the New Left propounds are in many respects the ideals of a democratic United States in its utopian form, its method of bringing about the changes requires radical reform, spelled r-e-v-o-l-u-t-i-o-n. Students attracted to the New Left are "impelled by political motives, by moral principles, or occasionally by a simple desire to engage in dramatic activity."³¹

Erikson sees a need for students to find expression through participation in the movements of the day, whether the riots of a local commotion or the parades and campaigns of major ideological forces: "The most widespread expression of the discontented search of youth is the craving for locomotion, whether expressed in a general 'being on the go,' 'tearing after something' or running around, or in locomotion proper, as in vigorous work, in absorbing sports, in rapt dancing."³² How much this accounts for the quick mobilization of students on the campus by the New Left is hard to estimate. But it must be considered in any attempt to

understand student unrest.

Until recent years campus politics was a game, an extracurricular activity that one could point out during an interview with a prospective employer. It has meant intramural politics—quarrels on the campus between students over elections for student legislatures and judiciary councils. Students might become involved with that most troublesome of all college problems, the hours at women's dormitories, but seldom did the campus politician become involved or even show interest in broader political issues. In the 1960's this changed. Massimo Teodori notes that the New Left movement began as a series of pressure tactics applied to the liberal elements of the establishment. In the South the activists who demanded civil rights for blacks turned to the followers of President Kennedy in Washington; in the North they searched for those Democratic congressional candidates who would support peace initiatives; even SDS arose under the auspices of the Social Democrats of the League for Industrial Democracy which exercised pressure on the Democratic Party.³³

Socialism was originally the ideology which united the leading groups of student rebels. The largest New Left group is the Students for a Democratic Society, a loose-knit, nationwide organization which claims more than 35,000 members on 250 campuses.³⁴ Among the other national student organizations on the left are the small W.E.B. DuBois clubs (Marxist), Progressive Labor Club (tends toward Maoism), Youth Socialist Alliance Party (Trotskyite), Young Peoples Socialist League (rightwing socialists), May Second Movement (anti-war in Vietnam), Youth International Party, and Third World Liberation Front.

All these groups are remarkably small for all the attention they have received in the mass media, but when there are issues that arouse students, cooperation

and participation with the New Left swells. For example, a *Fortune* survey found that 3 to 5 percent of the students say they will court arrest if the cause is right; 10 to 20 percent may become actively involved in support of the right cause, and as many as 50 percent may agree with the actions of those demonstrating.³⁵ When support of half the student body can be obtained, the New Left is a potent force indeed.

SDS, the movement's largest and most prominent organization, was organized in 1962 as an umbrella for radical and left-liberal activists. The organization's manifesto, known as the Port Huron statement, set forth a broad critique of society. Idealistic in nature, the manifesto affirmed the importance of the individual in society and set the goal of searching for

... truly democratic alternatives to the present, and a commitment to social experimentation. . . . [SDS would seek] . . . a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.³⁶

The first efforts of SDS were in the urban ghettos, where it practiced "participatory democracy." But with the intensification of the Vietnam war, SDS focus moved to students and the issues of war, the draft, university complicity, and student power. In April 1965, SDS was able to organize a march in Washington of some 20,000 people to protest the war. SDS also is credited with helping set up the first teach-in at the University of Michigan and soon thereafter initiating projects for draft resistance.³⁷ SDS embraced the idea of

having an independent power base where autonomous grassroots direct action could be taken and where there would be no ideological disputes with other progressive forces. By the spring of 1968, SDS had become transformed into an organization of self-consciously revolutionary students and ex-students. More than 1,000 young Marxists of widely varying schools of thought met that year for their national convention, and most candidates for national office were defining themselves as "revolutionary Communists."³⁸

Back on the campuses that fall, these rebels were making arbitrary demands to achieve "student power." They backed up their demands by the threat of force; they insisted on voting power over such things as the university budget and curriculum; the hiring, promotion, and salaries of faculty; and the recruiting of students. Over and over, the claim was heard that "people have a right to vote on anything that affects their lives."³⁹ Using the tactic of constant pressure—an old revolutionary strategy—SDS has put its effort toward bringing down the "corrupt" university as a first step toward bringing down the "corrupt" society.

A 1969 Yale graduate's statement is indicative of the difference of opinion which developed within the New Left:

I don't think the SDS is really bringing out the key issues. In the beginning SDS did have a feel for the issues, so did many liberals in the beginning. But in the last year or two, SDS has obscured the issues. Last year for example the big SDS controversy on the Campus was R.O.T.C. but that was simply a tactical tool to provoke confrontation in the university, to create chaos, and frankly to destroy. The real issue that SDS should have brought up and the one that needs to be discussed in the university is the war in

76 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

Vietnam. But it was not brought up because it did not provide SDS a base for an attack on the university.⁴⁰

By 1969 New Left goals had wandered far afield, and SDS had become so factionalized that to describe it requires the aid of charts. One student member explained the situation this way: "To fathom SDS sectarianism would task the most rigid purist . . . worst of all, of course, since it affects the whole movement, is SDS's introduction of hooligan methods into the radical movement on a scale not seen since the heyday of Stalinism."⁴¹ This thought was reinforced by a member of the International Socialists:

The [1969] SDS convention was a severe setback to the movement. The SDS now has chosen the Joe Stalin route and abandoned their program of anti-ideology, participatory democracy, and "Let the People Decide" . . . Radicals must now start all over winning the respect and confidence of the masses of young people who want social change.⁴²

What is the future for the radical left? Because it is incredibly diverse and is committed to individualism and violence, for the time being at least it will not be able to create a large-sized group with any disciplined cohesiveness. But it remains a potential force. Having been in on the "action" by calling for equal human rights for the Negro and prodding youth in its outcry for a return to moral values, the New Left should be considered as providing a great service—for it quite literally has forced America to examine these issues. But the service stops there, for the New Left has no answers for the questions it raises. If it persists in its Marxist, nihilist, and anarchist ways, one visualizes a strong reaction, perhaps even an over-

reaction, from society at large and then from students themselves. What happens to this radical element and what the radical element can make happen in the future cannot be predicted, but of more importance is the 50 percent of the students who find the same faults with society and the university as does the New Left. This much larger group does not want to overturn society. It does want a moral revolution, however. It is concerned, but if adult leadership can show that America is not corrupt, only unfulfilled, irrational and violent protests may die out. However, if it is not recognized that the motives of this larger group of students are genuine and sincere, and if careful consideration is not given to student criticisms, adults will be doing society a great disservice. If the establishment—be it society, the university, or the military—resists the legitimate grievances and the reasonable changes which the young people propose, discontent and dissent will only be perpetuated. The collapse of the radical and destructive behavior of the New Left can be hastened if the older generation will commit itself to the ideals of democracy and demonstrate with positive programs that it recognizes the validity of the legitimate grievances in the student protests.

IV—ANTIMILITARISM ON THE CAMPUS

With extensive prodding from New Left radicals, students have shown a large degree of political awakening during the 1960's. Students have a self-acknowledged regard for moral causes and the righting of what they perceive to be the country's wrongs; the Vietnam war was considered by great numbers of students, but not a majority, to be one of those wrongs.

Boulding's three theories of protest provide some understanding for student antimilitaristic protests. He says that protest is most likely (1) when there is a

strongly felt dissatisfaction which cannot be expressed through regular and legitimate channels; (2) when societies reach a state which is intrinsically unstable, but no change comes because there is no nucleus around which change can grow; and (3) when protest can be shrill, obstreperous, undignified, and careless of the existing legitimacy.¹

It is fair to say that for the student left, all of these conditions existed during the sixties. The students, who do not have the vote, are alienated from the country's political and economic system and have few, if any, responsibilities to society, fit Boulding's criteria well.

Further, Boulding points out that protest serves several purposes for those who pursue it as a course of action:

The first is publicity: it provides a way of bringing social problems to the attention of a wide public and of keeping them in the public eye. Second, protest is a means of building a context in which support can be attracted, organized, mobilized, and consolidated. A collective expression of beliefs or aims establishes and/or increases the sense of solidarity among those who share a common concern about a social problem. Third, protest serves to embarrass and press the relevant authorities. It is a way of exposing unfulfilled promises, values held by the wider public that are being violated . . . [and] . . . possible economic and political losses that the authorities could not face.²

The protesters appear to be well schooled in how to get attention and mobilize large masses of people for their causes. They sponsor demonstrations, parades, and other assertive activities which put them in the spotlight and on public display. Such activities serve a social need for recognition and exhibi-

tion on the part of the adolescent who may or may not fully understand the complexities of what he is protesting; and such large gatherings serve as communal symbols for enhancing group identity and provide visibility, admiration by some, and respect, and/or fear by others.³

Arnold S. Kaufman, one of the founders of the first teach-ins against the Vietnam war, claims that students were set in motion because of

. . . the Administration's decision, contrary to all assurances given before the [Presidential] election, to enlarge the war in Vietnam. The opposition of those already opposed to the U.S. policy was intensified; many others who had been teetering haplessly on the edge of indecision fell into opposition. The intensity of the reaction is very important . . . [for] dissent from official policy will not propel men into the sorts of action that have been taken unless they feel intensely opposed.⁴

The escalation of the Vietnam war and the subsequent increase of forces sent to Vietnam "aroused a protest movement which may be considered the most important political phenomenon of opposition that developed in the United States after World War II."⁵ Ultimately this protest movement found its most vocal support from students on the campuses.

Kaufman's early analysis of the Vietnam involvement appeared to be readily accepted by a large portion of the youth. They were looking for a reason to attack the "establishment," and Vietnam gave it to them. Kaufman said:

Opposition to Vietnamese policy has been in large part inspired by general dissatisfaction with the main lines of American foreign policy. Many of us who

78 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

endorsed the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine, who supported United States action in Berlin, Korea, and Cuba, are simply unwilling any longer to accept as valid the assumption that the threat communism poses is either monolithic or predominately military. Nor are we willing any longer to credit the claim that all revolutionary disturbances are essentially "conspiracies, engineered from the centers of Communist power." We do not propose abdication of responsibility. We are not isolationist, neoisolationists or crypto-isolationist. We will not be detracted by such vapid criticism.

Nor will we any longer accept the simpleminded litany about the fight between tyranny and freedom—between the forces of darkness and the forces of light. Far from being unwilling to acknowledge the existence of evil in the world, we realistically insist that these tendencies are as likely to be buried in the breast of the publishers of some Western news magazine as in the breast of the editor of Pravda. . . . Those who have inspired the teach-in movement believe that revolutionary movements must not be suppressed. Instead, this nation must learn to respect revolutionary energies that are consistent with a genuine concern for liberty and social justice. In some places they may take the form of social democracy. In other places the situation may require an accommodation with Communist power. For once we stop viewing communism as monolithic, we are free to consider the possibility that accommodation may be preferable to endorsement of some equally or more oppressive regime

which lacks even the degree of popular support that indigenous Communist movements enjoy. In any event, we are determined that de facto support of non-Communist tyrants shall not be concealed by the rhetoric of the American credo. What seems especially clear to us is that our policy makers have been neither resourceful nor always committed to the values of liberty and social justice in the making of American foreign policy. And it becomes increasingly clear that they do not even pursue our vital national interests effectively.⁶

This was the rationale used in the teach-ins during the spring of 1965, and in retrospect it appears that the teach-ins had much the same symbolic significance for the antiwar movement on the campuses that the Greensboro sit-in of February 1960 had had for the civil rights movement.

More than 50 teach-ins occurred around the country, but the surge of activity which brought together student and faculty, often for the first time, culminated after a march on Washington on 15 May 1965. The protest made by the faculty members against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam did not reach deep into the conscience of the majority of students at the very beginning, but as time passed and more troops were required, more and more students became involved in the demand for peace.

Boulding identifies some of the motivations of those who participated in the teach-ins:

. . . a genuine fear of escalation into nuclear warfare . . . a sense of moral outrage at the use of such things as napalm and the "lazy dog" and the appalling sufferings which we are imposing on the Vietnamese in the supposed name of freedom and democ-

raey... Some people on the left... were politically sympathetic with the objectives of the Vietcong... I am inclined to think that the largest motivation factor was a sense of simple human sympathy with the sufferings of the Vietnamese, and a sense of outrage at the utterly inhuman weapons of the American air force, and a sense of outrage also that we were using Vietnamese as the guinea pigs in weapons experimentation.⁷

Although teach-in rhetoric may have given hope to the New Left, campus intellectuals did little to influence the Nation as a whole with their plea for peace. The Harris polls indicate a continuous decline in the Nation's demand for negotiation and withdrawal from Vietnam once the teach-ins started. In March 1965 the Harris poll showed 38 percent favoring negotiation and withdrawal, but by September only 14 percent held that opinion.⁸ Thus the teach-in movement collapsed, but such sessions served the student movement quite well, for it provided the emotion-filled words to continue attacking the U.S. war effort.

The students seemed to be saying:

The Vietnam war, since we were the ones who were called to fight it, led us to make our first moral judgments. For a while we supported it—we supported the notion that we were helping a beleaguered country maintain its independence. But it soon became clear that this was an American war. We were destroying more than we could possibly reconstruct. We were supporting not a legitimate government representing the aspiration of the people, but a corrupt clique.⁹

Bombarded as they were by television news coverage of the war and

constantly seeing the impact of death, it is no surprise that the students should form such an attitude. They were being pumped with confusing and conflicting reports from reporters and Government officials; they were hearing reports of a rising death count; they were being told of the billions of dollars such a war effort takes. And they were seeing less and less hope for victory.

One radical student expressed his feelings this way: "When I think of war, of bombs startling children and splashing horror on faces of screaming mothers I nearly go mad with anger... I want to fight something, whatever it is, that creates war."¹⁰

Another account of what those on campus were thinking is equally harsh but more balanced:

... the collegiate population is appalled by the slaughter of Vietnamese civilians by American troops. Conversation on campuses center upon the desolation of villages by napalm and the leveling of landscape by bombs and heavy American artillery. It is indeed, a paradox that students are not nearly so conscious or articulate about the very real atrocities carried on by the Viet Cong. Nor are they impressed by the terror tactics used by the Viet Cong during the last election. The reason for this can be found in the general belief that much of this Viet Cong activity is caused by the presence of American troops... It is also quite obvious that students are adversely affected by the constant television coverage of the war, the scenes of children and elderly people being killed, and the graphic description of defloration of the countryside.¹¹

Yet another observer says that the war has shocked America's young people, but that the

... greatest shock of all to the idealism of the young is the way in which official spokesmen manipulate and even hoodwink the public opinion that they are supposed to lead. A whole apparatus of evasion has been developed in which nothing is an outright lie, and yet nothing quite means what it seems to say. The very words are unreal: de-escalation, ultimate deterrent, agonizing reappraisal—a tasteless vocabulary of plastic which George Orwell prophetically called Newspeak.¹²

The criticisms expressed in the above quotations should put the American Government on alert and keep it that way. Of course no war is easy to explain, and Vietnam is no exception. But when large segments of the population become disillusioned with the Government's use of power or its national purpose, that Government should know full well that trouble lies ahead.

By spring 1967 a Gallup poll showed that 35 percent of the students polled identified themselves as "doves," while 49 percent classified themselves as "hawks." The students had responded to the question, "People call themselves 'hawks' if they want to step up our military effort in Vietnam. They are called 'doves' if they want to reduce our military effort in Vietnam. How would you describe yourself—as a hawk or a dove?"

It was not until December 1969 that the campus mood was recorded shifting sharply toward peace, according to another Gallup poll, with 69 percent of the students classifying themselves as doves and 20 percent saying they were hawks.¹³

Local marches for peace as well as mass marches, attracting as many as 250,000 people to Washington, have been the major efforts of the concerned students. Most of these marches have been peaceful attempts to show the

administration that the marchers do not believe in the war effort. But for the radical students, more dramatic confrontations, often involving some type of violence, were seen as a tactic for getting officials to use force to enforce the law, thus allowing these students to cry "repression."

Although it is not the intent of this paper to analyze the Vietnam war, it does appear that the policy of "butter and bullets" was a mistake. The youth of today represent a generation which needs to be told "why" they are doing things. A low-keyed effort to commit hundreds of thousands of men to a war thousands of miles away without committing the American public was a major failing. It is a failure that cannot be repeated in the future without the United States experiencing the same kind of dissent experienced during the Vietnam war.

Because of the failure in Vietnam, it is easy to envision the American people being reluctant in the years ahead to move quickly and with power to the aid of America's allies; Vietnam memories will undoubtedly remain uppermost in the minds of this generation of young people for years to come, just as World War II and the threat of communism so thoroughly influenced an earlier generation. The American people will retain their concern and sympathy for the oppressed people of the world, but the impact of death, atrocities, and destruction will have to be well publicized, even propagandized, so that the demand for future U.S. interventions comes from the U.S. people themselves. Without such a mandate it is doubtful, given the frustrations of Vietnam, that any administration, in the near future, would commit ground forces in a limited war to assist allies. Future wars of the limited war category will have to be packaged and sold, using Madison Avenue techniques, making sure to explain that limited war is long, dirty, and political.

Much of the visible indignation toward the Vietnam war by students has been displayed against the draft. Again, the New Left led the way. But protest occurs not merely because the draft is a mechanism to provide manpower into the Armed Forces to fight a war in which many of these students do not believe; students also complain because the draft is a means of guiding youth into civilian activities that society finds desirable. They cite a document once circulated by the Selective Service which says that throughout his career as a student "the pressure—the threat of loss of deferment—continues. It continues with equal intensity after graduation. . . . He is impelled to pursue his skill in an essential activity in the national interest."¹⁴

For a generation of students who want freedom from all sorts of repression, such channeling was viewed with as much anger as the draft laws themselves.

It should be remembered, however, that Americans have generally had a dislike for conscription; it is not a new phenomenon, just one rediscovered because of the needs of Vietnam.

The initial successes in the American War of Independence at Concord and Bunker Hill were with the militiamen. But the colonists were anxious to find substitutes for their own men: foreigners, deserters from other armies, and Negroes who were freed after entering military service.¹⁵

During the War of 1812 with England, the subject of Federal conscription first received serious attention. However, the House and Senate were unable to agree on the terms of their bills. Thus, it was not until the Civil War that the United States gained its first experience with conscription. When enacting the first full-fledged national conscription act in 1863, Congress gave the right to buy exemptions or hire substitutes. However, failure to respond to the call made a man subject to punishment for

desertion, and resisting the draft or aiding or encouraging others to do so made him subject to a fine or imprisonment.¹⁶

In 1917 it became necessary once again for Congress to seriously consider the draft. No longer was there any controversy about the need; the debate was now over how the draft act should be applied. One of the points at issue was whether liquor and prostitutes should be made available to the soldiers;¹⁷ the law was finally passed—without this provision. Registration day went off with a *clat*. A holiday spirit was evident as men between 21 and 30 lined up to register. However, it was still necessary for the Department of Justice to institute a series of "slacker" raids. Until public protest brought intervention from the President, Justice Department personnel surrounded areas which appeared to have large numbers of delinquents. All men seemingly of draft age were taken into custody and held until their status was determined.¹⁸ Some 9½ million men registered, and a lottery system was used to select the 687,000 men needed for immediate service. Some 30 percent were found physically unfit, and nearly 25 percent were judged illiterate. There were 337,649 draft dodgers.¹⁹

The Nazi blitzkrieg in Western Europe provided the impetus for the Nation's first peacetime conscription, but even this danger did not bring all Americans together. A nationwide poll showed only 71 percent of those expressing an opinion to be in favor of the draft. Among males between the age of 16 and 24, only 65 percent said they favored a plan of service, even though it would be limited to 1 year.²⁰

Since 1965 the Vietnam war has been a powerful source of disaffection for college students. The draft has been a major factor in the lives of the young men in college—a reason to get into college in the first place and then to stay there as long as possible.

The first significant organized anti-draft movement was a group called the Resistance. It represented the melding of members of various groups opposed to the Vietnam war: pacifists, civil rights workers, anti-imperialists, leftists. Even ex-soldiers, former Peace Corpsmen, and previous moderate students joined the movement. Because the war was unpopular among many alienated American youth and because they wanted to show their disapproval, the symbolic draft card burning demonstrations began. The idea germinated after the first acts were well publicized by the mass media. As evidenced by the great numbers of draft dodgers in World War I, youth have said "no" before, but their refusals in the past have been largely invisible, and their actions have held little promise of stimulating others to similar acts or of changing national policy. The Resistance members, however, publicized their actions and provided a visible and political mechanism for translating their outrage to the "establishment." For some, draft card burning was seen as a potent form of moral witness. Others, schooled in the civil rights movement, viewed cooperation with the Resistance as an extension of civil disobedience and a rejection of a racially and class-biased draft. Still others saw the draft as abridging their own personal freedom and resistance as an initial act of personal liberation.²¹

At the same time the Resistance was formed in San Francisco, other groups arose: New England Resist in Boston, Cadre in Chicago, and Draft Denial in New York, as well as affiliated or supporting groups such as Support in Action, the Committee for Draft Resistance, the Boston Draft Resistance Group, and the Wisconsin Draft Resistance Unit. Some of these groups joined nationally in May 1967 during the Student Mobilization Conference in Chicago. The result of this new independent movement appeared on a large scale the following October with the

first "Stop the Draft Week" during which 1,400 draft cards reportedly were collected in 18 cities and returned to the local and national officials of the Selective Service System.²² This resistance to the draft was highest during 1967 and 1968 when the war was at a point directly involving the largest group of young men.

The New Left was quick to see the draft issue as a cause to be exploited on the campuses. SDS put out an antidraft button which declared, "NOT WITH MY LIFE YOU DONT" and also circulated a pamphlet announcing the main purpose of the Selective Service System as one of "manpower channeling." Because SDS had at that time the organization to mobilize support, they were able to gear up for massive attacks. The other resistance groups were too small and badly coordinated to contribute much more than individual example, whereas SDS could provide action. As part of SDS's attack, it distributed a "Vietnam Exam" to coincide with the draft eligibility tests. Such action by SDS was considered a key to the development and growth of SDS itself, both tactically and ideologically. Tactically, it marked the active participation of the SDS chapters throughout the nation in various types of illegal pursuits from individual and collective draft card burnings to an attempt by more than 1,000 persons to shut down the Oakland Induction Center in October 1967.²³

But to categorize this college generation with unwillingness to serve is clearly in error. One indicator of this is a student opinion poll conducted by the National Student Association in 1967 of 30,500 students at 23 campuses throughout the country. This poll showed that 90 percent of the students believed that the Government has the right to conscript its citizens, and 68 percent thought such conscription was necessary in periods other than those of declared national emergency. But the

students did voice the desire for an alternative. Of the students polled, 75 percent preferred the Government to establish a volunteer service corps such as the Peace Corps, the Teachers Corps, or Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) as an alternative to military service. And about 60 percent of the students favored eliminating deferments for college students in order to make the draft fairer for the black and the poor people.²⁴

Although the draft is blamed for much of the discontent on campuses today, a study during the Columbia University crisis in 1968 showed that it is "not true that worry over one's own chances of being drafted was a major factor in the discontent or the special manifestations which it took in the Columbia situation." The study indicated that generalized unhappiness with the war was important, but this applied regardless of draft status. Seventy percent of the students and 69 percent of the faculty responding to the survey were opposed to the Vietnam war, but only 15 percent of the students thought that their chances were at least 50-50 of being drafted in the next year or two. About 75 percent of those who opposed the war, but only 33 percent of those who did not oppose the war, agreed with the statement: "I support the idea of the Poor People's March on Washington to achieve more for black people and poor." About half of the antiwar people, compared with only 20 percent of those who did not oppose the war, agreed with the statement: "I am in favor of many of the goals of the black movement."²⁵

Thus it can be seen by this study that one of the compelling problems perceived by those who are against the war is the need to correct poverty and racial injustice at home rather than to be committed overseas.

Another form of draft resistance is the challenge of some young men not against conscription generally, but

against conscription to fight in Vietnam. For example, David H. Mitchell challenged his conviction for refusing to report for induction on the ground that the Vietnam war was a "war of aggression" and a "crime against peace" and as such was outlawed by various treaties. However, a circuit court of appeals held in 1966 that whatever the status of the conflict in Vietnam, Congress did have the power to raise and support armies and therefore to induct Mitchell. When the Supreme Court refused to review the case in 1967, it appeared this tactic would be a dead issue.²⁶

As early as 1918 the Supreme Court heard cases testing the legality of conscription. At that time, in a decision given the label of Selective Draft Law Cases, the Court upheld the conscription act. The Court's decision remains today the basic statement of the Supreme Court on the power of the Federal Government to conscript military manpower. The Court has judged that Congress has the legitimate power to raise and support armies and to make all laws necessary and proper to exercise their power. Furthermore, the Court rejected the notion that conscription was involuntary servitude and thus was not in violation of the 13th amendment.²⁷

One of the important points the activist students never seemed to talk about was that even before most of the antidraft demonstrations began, the Department of Defense, Congress, and a National Advisory Commission on Selective Service were meeting and hearing testimony from the American people in preparation to revise the draft laws. When President Johnson established his advisory commission, he directed that they were to review the Selective Service and other systems of national service in light of the following factors:

1. Fairness to all citizens;
2. Military manpower requirements;

3. The objective of minimizing uncertainty and interference with individual careers and education;

4. Social, economic and employment conditions and goals;

5. Budgetary and administrative considerations, and

6. Any other factors that the Commission may deem relevant.²⁸

The Commission reported its findings to the President in February 1967 after having spent more than 100 hours in meetings in Washington alone. The transcript of these meetings took more than 3,500 pages. Opinions from more than 120 organizations across the country were invited, plus those of college student leaders, some 250 editors of student newspapers, all local draft boards (more than 4,000), the 97 appeal boards, many prominent private citizens, and every governor.²⁹

The Commission's major recommendations were: to reverse the "oldest first" order to call to "youngest first" beginning at age 19; to continue the draft, but on an impartial and random basis; and to eliminate most student and occupational deferments.³⁰

Thus the Commission showed a great deal of empathy toward the students who were so critical of the draft laws. Yet it took almost 3 years to implement these recommendations, and even today the deferment policy for college students exists as an open sore for many students as well as nonstudents. However, to believe that earlier changes in the draft laws would have abruptly halted the antidraft protests is not reasonable. The New Left would still have kept the pressure on; no change would have been satisfactory. They insist on no draft laws.

Although the possibility of an all-volunteer military force was examined in 1966 by the President's Commission reviewing the draft laws, the idea was rejected by the Commission because:

... it would permit no flexibility for crisis... [and] ... could easily—it is feared—become a mercenary force unrepresentative of the nation... The sudden need for greater numbers of men would find the nation without the machinery to meet it. To a Commission deliberating grave issues of life and death in an atmosphere created by just such a sudden need, this is of overriding significance. It was this stark and uncontroverted fact which was the most persuasive in forging the Commission's conviction that the nation now, and in the foreseeable future, have a system which includes the draft. Only with such a flexible system can the military services be assured of their ability always to have the numbers of men necessary to fulfill the mission demanded of them for the nation's security.³¹

However, when President Nixon ran for office he indicated a desire for an all-volunteer military, and he created a commission to specifically determine its feasibility. This new commission recently recommended an all-volunteer military. Whether one will ever actually be established cannot be predicted at this point, but if the national interests can be met on a volunteer basis, one of the causes of discontent for hundreds of thousands of young men will disappear.

George Reedy pinpoints much of the problem of the antidraft demonstrations when he identifies the New Left as a prime mover in stirring up protest:

The student left, although it is otherwise devoid of Marxist economics and philosophy, has rediscovered the old fashioned Marxist theory of imperialistic war and has applied it to the conflict. Articulate spokesmen of

the Students for a Democratic Society dominate campus meetings on compulsory military service and speakers must face their sharp questioning. . . . Draft card burnings and draft board sit-ins are so dramatic that they create the impression that they express college attitudes. . . . The concept that there is an obligation to fight for their country is so alien [for the student left] that schemes to avoid the draft are debated quite openly and without the slightest trace of self-consciousness.³²

Reedy's comment is valid, yet the incidence of draft resistance is not as great as one would imagine. *Ramparts* magazine probably is reflective of a great majority of draft-age men: "He complains of the uncertainty which he must endure; he would like to be able to do as he pleases; he would appreciate a certain future with no prospect of military service or civilian contribution, but he complies . . ."³³

Army Times reported that since July 1966, 1,403 military men have crossed international boundaries to desert and that total desertions have gone up dramatically during fiscal year 1969.³⁴

<u>Service</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Army	2.15%	2.91%	4.24%
Marine Corps	2.68%	2.24%	4.02%

Yet these desertion rates are not so dramatic when compared to World War II rates, although they are greater than those of the Korean war.³⁵

<u>Service</u>	<u>1944</u>	<u>1945</u>	<u>1952</u>	<u>1953</u>	<u>1954</u>
Army	6.30%	4.52%	2.25%	1.95%	1.55%
Marine Corps	0.69%	0.54%	1.97%	2.96%	--

The military does recognize that there are people who have enlisted or complied with the draft simply to continue their antiwar and antidraft pro-

tests from the inside. But Army Chief of Staff Gen. William C. Westmoreland said recently: "The problem of dissenters is almost infinitesimal in terms of numbers and impact on combat effectiveness." He defined dissenters as soldiers taking part in antiwar or antimilitary demonstrations, rallies, or meetings; those affiliated with dissident organizations, those involved with producing underground newspapers, circulating petitions, and the like. Westmoreland said the number of dissenters in the Army as of April 1969 was 421 soldiers, with only 114 of these considered as hard core.³⁶

The discontent such a small number of men could arouse within the military is not known. But commanding officers would be well advised to recognize and respect the constitutional right of free speech. Dissenters should certainly be viewed with suspicion, and low-keyed review of their activities should be the practice, not continual and petty harassment; "benign neglect" of the dissenter's off-duty activities is in order. If the Military Establishment is so weak that a few men at each base can present a "clear and present danger," it is time for some full-scale investigations.

No organization is without grievances, and what needs to be done is to identify these grievances; if the present channels of communication are inadequate, new ones must be established. Many of the root causes of student unrest exist within the military, and commanding officers should recognize this and include enlisted men on committees which deal with their lives.

That dissent has not been a major problem in the military indicates either that soldiers perceive that disruptive actions would not be tolerated and therefore are futile or that the present leadership provides sufficient freedom of expression and personal dialog which effectively lowers the discontent level to

the point where frustrations are tolerable.

James Sterba explains why dissenters are not more prevalent in Vietnam today:

... it is amazing how much your values changed. Despite what all the philosophers and politicians and social scientists said, you were an animal with one basic instinct dominating all others: survival... Absolutely everything becomes at once irrelevant except survival. If there was ever an event that "blew your mind" being shot at was it. After it, you were not the same person... Many of the concerned grunts, before they got here, had serious qualms about the use of napalm. But now, in the middle of combat, they would tell you there was absolutely nothing in the world more beautiful than the sight of those silver canisters tumbling end over end from a jet bomber and exploding in a huge ball of red flames and black smoke right where the gooks were shooting from. They felt like cheering, and sometimes they did.³⁷

Anti-ROTC Protests. Military training on college campuses has been under varying degrees of pressure since its inception in 1916. But during the 1960's the tempo picked up drastically as the student left found ROTC an undefended target.

The Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) was established by the National Defense Act of 1916. The first organized ROTC units were set up in colleges and universities by the Army in the same year, by the Navy in 1926, and by the Air Force in 1946 (even before it became a separate service). In 1964 the ROTC Vitalization Act established the present statutory basis for ROTC programs. As of September 1969, ROTC

units were in operation at 353 colleges or universities. The Army has units on 283 campuses, the Navy on 54, and the Air Force on 174. About 100 additional colleges are served through cross-registration arrangements.³⁸

Historical Overview. Although the National Defense Act never made military training a compulsory requirement, soon after the ROTC units were established, teachers attacked ROTC training as militaristic. They saw militarism, whether in the form of military training or of pressure from the veterans' organizations, as incompatible with a philosophy of education that sought, in the spirit of James and Dewey, to encourage the potentialities of the individual and the well-being of society.³⁹ Nevertheless, this was not the dominant mood, and some teachers were dismissed or rebuked for expressing pacifist or anti-militarist views.

Surprisingly enough, it was not the State legislatures who normally made military training compulsory; the school boards or administrators and faculties did so either on their own initiative or under pressure from the War Department. When the Legislature of Wisconsin prescribed that the training should be elective in 1923, Secretary of War John W. Weeks, under the impression that compulsory military training was required by law, complained to the Department of Interior only to be told that Wisconsin was within her rights.⁴⁰

Although ROTC was not entirely popular on college campuses from the beginning, comparatively few students embraced either an extreme pacifist position or a rabid militarist position after World War I. There were college antidrill leagues, and petitions were distributed for abolishing compulsory ROTC. One student poll conducted in 1932 by the Intercollegiate Disarmament Council revealed 81 percent of the students polled opposed compulsory ROTC with 38 percent favoring the

elimination of all military drill on campus.⁴¹

In an effort to arouse public interest in eliminating ROTC entirely, a group of liberal educators and pacifists formed the Committee on Militarism in Education (CME), which issued a pamphlet claiming ROTC "was indoctrinating American youth with a psychology of militarism." However, a study of 10,000 ROTC graduates of the period from 1920 to 1930, by Maj. Ralph Chesney Bishop with the cooperation of the U.S. Office of Education, refuted CME's contention. Bishop's report showed that 93.6 percent of the ROTC graduates polled said "no" to the question of whether their training had tended to instill an attitude of militarism inimical to world peace.⁴²

Criticism of the ROTC programs was countered at the highest level when Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall lectured the antimilitary factions:

The pacifist and disarmament enthusiasts of our country who reason that war is terrible and horrible and therefore should not be resorted to have launched a manifesto against military training in American colleges and schools. They know that in this student field they will find young men in their most impressionable stage of development. And above all, they realize that in this field, the fertility of which lies in the fact of finding perfected, systematic and strong organizations, without the burden of responsibilities, furnishes them an opportunity that has been used by all radicals and revolutionists of recorded history. . . . In this very democratic nation of ours, and in the absence of universal service in this country, our need of reserve officers can be supplied only through our educational system. As our civil activities look to these educa-

tional institutions for their future leaders, so also must the defense of the country look to the colleges and universities for material as the natural resources of military leadership.⁴³

New Left Attacks. It was only after the Vietnam war was intensified in 1965 that efforts to eliminate ROTC began to swell. Taking antiwar frustrations out on the ROTC became commonplace. At Columbia, for example, students blocked the doors to Low Memorial Library and caused a Naval ROTC ceremony to be postponed. At Cornell essentially the same thing took place, but somewhat more dramatically, with the students depositing themselves on the parade grounds. Such tactics were repeated across the country. When the New Left entered the action in earnest, the efforts were centered on "destroying" ROTC; arson ultimately became the *modus operandi*.

SDS provided the greatest stimulus to the anti-ROTC protests. In its *Organizers' Manual for the Spring Offensive*, SDS revealed a plan to "Smash the Military in the Schools" and called for its local chapters to demand:

1. Immediate withdrawal from Vietnam;
2. End to ROTC;
3. End to counterinsurgency and police training;
4. End to draft assemblies in high schools, and
5. Open admissions for all Third World and white working class people.⁴⁴

An examination of these demands shows that SDS provided "something for everyone." Although a student might not be against ending ROTC, chances were good that he might be against the war. With large segments of the student population against the Vietnam war and even larger segments championing the cause of the Negroes

and the poor, SDS had found another cause to radicalize the students.

SDS exhorted its members to oppose ROTC because:

(a) It provides the leadership for an army engaged in imperialist aggression against popular movements at home and abroad. The caretakers of imperialism must be stopped.

(b) ROTC is a class privilege—it is available only to those segments of the middle and working classes who can go to college. Ideologically, it strengthens the view that ordinary working people in America are unworthy to guide the nation's destiny.

(c) Even in the class privileged context ROTC people are oppressed. ROTC can only be seen as an alternative to an even worse reality—the draft.⁴⁵

With campus organizations across the country, SDS was readying for its attack. Clearly, reform was not its intention. The plan was one of escalating “mini” actions to help build consciousness and to dramatize the issue. The report said: “Beginning with guerrilla theatre actions in dorms we can escalate to disrupt classes, street marches, quick assaults on buildings, etc., before moving to the major confrontation of the struggle.”⁴⁶

On four occasions the facilities of the Naval ROTC unit at the University of California at Berkeley were burned or bombed; the NROTC units at Columbia, Harvard, Stanford, the University of Michigan, the University of Texas, and the University of Washington were similarly attacked. Stanford's NROTC building was totally destroyed, and damage to the University of Washington's NROTC building was estimated at \$110,000.⁴⁷

At Harvard University SDS used the demand to abolish ROTC to further support and build its movement to end the Vietnam war. For many of the faculty members, however, the central publicly stated issue with ROTC was whether or not ROTC courses “measured up” to the high intellectual standards of the university. But this was not relevant to SDS; it wanted Harvard faculty members to take a political stand, a stand that would say that Harvard was “not willing to aid and abet the American government's aggression in Vietnam.”⁴⁸

At Harvard, the Student-Faculty Committee (SFAC) proposed removing academic credit from ROTC courses, while the university's Committee on Educational Policy presented a resolution to the faculty to upgrade the academic content of ROTC courses so that they would conform to the school's academic standards. The faculty passed the SFAC resolution, but the administration apparently wanted to retain ROTC for it began to negotiate with the Pentagon to find a way to continue the program. SDS intensified the struggle for having ROTC abolished by making specific demands on Harvard, including those concerning university expansion, black studies, and amnesty for students who had been disciplined for previous protests. Then SDS voted to seize University Hall. Such disruptive tactics were repeated at other schools.

Criticisms of ROTC. Not all university groups critical of the ROTC program took such radical stands. For example, the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) at the University of Pennsylvania published a report in 1968 which did not couch its arguments in antimilitary or antiwar terms, but rather strongly criticized the instructors, textbooks, curriculum, outside obligations of students, and the limitation placed on the student's political expression and activity.

The report said:

SCUE contends that the contractual obligation assumed by the University undergraduates in ROTC programs seriously infringe upon their status as students and the status of the University as an open forum. The University owes the student a free, neutral environment. The student in his junior year, for example, must always be capable of substantially altering or rejecting opinions and affiliations that he formed in his sophomore year. The ROTC programs, however, force students into a mold formed by the interaction of legal, financial, and military strictures. In this sense, the student is deprived of his right to change and to experiment. In addition, the University loses its objectivity by sanctioning, through accreditation, the presence of the programs on campus.⁴⁹

Arthur M. Schlesinger demonstrates how confused some faculty members can become with his attack on military training:

The nationwide controversy that is raging over the question of military training in the colleges illustrates again how confused our thinking has become in regard to education. The whole system of soldier training rests upon the complete subjection of one man's will to that of another. If we accept the premise that the primary reason for students going to college is to learn how to use their minds, anything which actually defeats this purpose, however desirable in itself, is to be condemned. It would seem clear, therefore, that military training, whether compulsory or voluntary,

has no place in a university that is consecrated to the ideal of cultivating individual initiative, independent thinking, and intellectual leadership.⁵⁰

One wonders how many ROTC classes Professor Schlesinger had attended or how many military students he had talked with to warrant writing such a comment. As a former instructor of Naval Science at the University of Washington, this writer finds no justification or validity in Schlesinger's condemnation of military training. In fact, what military instructors stress most to their students is their need to develop individual initiative, independent thinking, and a wide range of leadership traits, including intellectual leadership. For Schlesinger to even conceive that the goals of military training in America's universities are anything less than preparing young men for dedicated service, with the highest sense of personal honor and integrity, is evidence that the military services have failed to educate the educators.

A pro-ROTC view was expressed by the Student Senate at the University of Cincinnati where a student proposal to abolish ROTC because its programs are "antithetical to the purpose and viability of an educational institution" was voted down 22 to 5. The student committee assigned to investigate ROTC's role in the university found that ROTC did contribute to each of the university's objectives: "[ROTC] preserves and disseminates knowledge now available in the arts, sciences and various professional areas important to modern life; educates men and women by example and teaching, for a fuller and richer life as responsible citizens; serves the community and the public at large." John Appel, student chairman of the committee, underscored a major and perhaps decisive point which favors the continuance of the ROTC on the campus when he explained that the military

courses are electives so "there is absolutely no coercion" involved in taking them.⁵¹

A report prepared by ROTC students presents another valid reason for continuing ROTC regardless of the pressures placed upon the university by the radical antiwar groups:

Those who object to the inclusion of military science in the liberal arts curriculum on the basis that it is not "humanistic or academic" assign these words very narrow limits. They misunderstand the essential nature of Humanism and of a liberal arts education. The first Humanists were those who found excitement in the study of Man in all his aspects, his capacity for love and for violence, his desire to dominate and his willingness to serve, and his passion for knowledge.⁵²

Blue Ribbon Review. As with the draft laws, a special committee was established by the Government to review the entire ROTC program. In a report to the Secretary of Defense in September 1969, the committee concluded that

... on the assumption that the armed forces will be generally of the same order of magnitude as those prior to the intervention in the Vietnam war and that ROTC will continue to provide officers primarily for the active forces (currently ROTC supplies more than half of the regular officers) as well as for the reserve forces, its continuance on campus is clearly in the national interest.⁵³

The committee addressed its review to the basic questions, e.g.,

1. Is there a better means than ROTC of educating such officers?

2. Is there any basic academic impropriety in governmental use of colleges and universities as sites for military education?

3. Are there adjustments which should be made by the services to insure a greater cooperation on the part of academic administrators, faculties, and students?

4. Are there accommodations which should be made by the faculties, administrators, and students of universities and colleges to assure the Nation this valuable source of commissioned officers?⁵⁴

As noted earlier the committee did recommend that ROTC be continued but it also urged:

... one overriding priority must be recognized, namely the national security of the country. . . . Without national security we have no basis for pursuing our multiple and diverse activities. The national government can properly look to public institutions, supported as they are by the taxpayer, to provide leadership in safeguarding the entire population. Nor can the nation's privately supported universities be exempted from a part in the responsibility. Their tax exempt status in itself constitutes a notable government subsidy, and many of them receive extensive state and federal subventions. Where not bound by federal or state legislation, each institution must make its own decision with regard to ROTC in accordance with its own processes and priorities, but in the interest both of national security and a general service to society, the committee believes that there is a strong case for the ROTC program on the college and university campus.⁵⁵

The committee went a long way, by its recommendations, in smoothing over the problems that have long bothered universities and their faculties. For example, the committee recommended that the university and the services cooperatively develop the ROTC curriculum rather than permitting the Secretary of each military department to prescribe the curriculum, that continued efforts be made to develop better materials to use the student's time and effort to best advantage so that academic credit can be assigned for each course, and that contracts and regulations within the separate ROTC programs be thoroughly reviewed and standardized if possible.⁵⁶

In tackling the cry of many who urge ROTC to abolish drill from the campus because it is "an obvious symbol of 'militarism' or 'regimentation' inappropriate to a liberal arts college environment," the committee said: "... drill is an integral part of the military. The suggestion that the military has no regimentation would be as false as to suggest that the military can accomplish its mission without fighting."⁵⁷

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has approved all the committee's recommendations except one, which called for the Federal Government to pay for the institutional costs of ROTC and which needed further study.

Implementation of the committee's recommendations will certainly improve the ROTC program and military relations with the universities. But no amount of revision has been able to convince some universities of the necessity of ROTC. As of February 1970, five of the prestigious east coast schools—Harvard, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth, and Tufts—had decided that ROTC must go. Additionally, there are schools which have decided that no credit will be granted for any ROTC courses—Cornell, Princeton, Stanford, Yale, Virginia, and Pennsylvania.⁵⁸ At these campuses, the no-credit decision

may well mean the death knell for ROTC unless the program can be made flexible enough to meet both the military needs and those of the university.

The protests against ROTC demonstrate two important factors which must be considered when evaluating the potential of any protest movement. The questions to be asked are: (1) Is the status quo reasonable, or are changes necessary? (2) Are there elements of power which need to be educated as to the value of what might be protested?

In the case of ROTC, it is evident that a revitalization of the program was needed. The old practice of autonomy never was compatible with the university environment and could have been modified years earlier without degrading the military courses. And as faculty senates gained more and more power within the university structure, an education program could have been started to "sell" the faculty the importance of ROTC as a vital input to the national defense. For years the ROTC operated under the assumption that it could call the shots, and therefore little effort was expended to convince the faculty that the military courses did "measure up."

V—ANTIMILITARISM IN THE UNITED STATES

We have seen that the escalation of the Vietnam war in 1965 brought loud and often violent antiwar protests from the college campuses throughout the United States. By 1969, however, the broad bipartisan consensus that characterized American foreign policy for two decades after World War II had been overcome by widespread, bipartisan confusion. In some quarters America's foreign policy was under severe attack; politicians had begun reversing themselves which only led to further confusion. The frustrations and disillusionment with Vietnam had finally taken their toll. A *Time*-Louis Harris poll in May 1969 showed that Americans were

no longer willing to resist overt Communist aggression against U.S. allies: only 26 percent would support such resistance in Berlin, 25 percent in Thailand, and 27 percent in Japan.¹ This change in direction had, however, long been advocated by the antiwar segments of the college campus who saw Vietnam as an internal struggle of no concern to the United States or who saw the loss of Vietnam to communism as no threat to the balance of power and U.S. national security. Rather, the need they saw was to reduce U.S. commitments overseas and to increase spending within the United States to improve the conditions of life. Because of the Government's actions in Vietnam, the accusation was that the United States was militaristic.

Militarism has long connoted a domination of the military man over the civilian and has been viewed as a waste of a nation's best manpower in unproductive army service. When a country imposes heavy burdens on its people for military purposes, to the neglect of its people's welfare, it is called militaristic.²

The thinkers of the Enlightenment of the 18th century probably have been the most critical of the use of military strength to achieve objectives. Diderot objected to monarchies which, to preserve their power, subordinated everything to the military. Montesquieu denounced as an epidemic the desire of kings to enlarge their forces endlessly to keep the peace, but which in reality only led to poverty and degradation. Voltaire was far sharper in his criticism. He called soldiers hired murderers and the scum of the nation. Rousseau said armies were the pests which depopulated Europe; he advocated requiring every citizen to be a soldier from duty, but none by profession. Kant voiced the hope that standing armies would come to an end, for "they threaten other states continually with war by their readiness to appear always ready for war."³

Today, critics of military power again are warning against what they perceive to be excesses in militarism. Senator J. William Fulbright cautions:

With military expenditures providing the livelihood of some 10% of our work force; with 22,000 major corporate defense contractors and another 100,000 sub-contractors; with defense plants and installations located in 363 of the 435 Congressional districts; with the Department of Defense spending 7.5 billion dollars on research and development in 1969, making it the largest consumer of research output in the nation—millions of Americans whose only interest is in making a decent living have acquired a vested interest in an economy geared to war. These benefits, once obtained, are not easily parted with. Every new weapons system or military installation soon acquires a constituency. The process is aided and abetted by the perspicacity with which Pentagon officials award lucrative contracts and establish new plants and installations in the districts of influential members of Congress.⁴

Even military professionals have taken the Government to task. Retired Gen. David Shoup, former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, said recently: "Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom."⁵

John Kenneth Galbraith is one of the leading advocates of getting the "military-industrial complex" under control to prevent further growth of militarism. He proposes Congress do this by establishing a Military Audit Commission to serve as a watchdog on political negotia-

tions and be staffed with "experts" who would speak with an authoritative voice on weapons systems and insure that approval would not be given for armaments that only add to international tension or competition or serve the prestige of the services or the profits of their suppliers. He calls getting the military-industrial complex under control the political issue of our time, and he is championing the cause by trying to keep Congress in a vigilant, critical, and aroused mood.⁶

America has not always been militaristic—if it is that today. Americans inherited the British distrust of large professional standing armies, regarding them as a threat to their liberties. But then, America could afford such a distrust in its early years because it was faced with few wars and world involvement.⁷ Pre-20th century Americans had strong feelings against military professionalism. The Regular Army was little more than a token force. Conscription was despised and rejected until the Civil War. Even in the Civil War the draftees were secondary to the volunteers.⁸

Although professional military officers often take the brunt of any criticism of the "system," civilians control and direct the military. Thus, lay militarists are defined as civilians who "unquestioningly embrace military values, ethos, principles, attitudes... [and who]... dedicate the nation's resources to war, with the inevitability and advocacy of war always presumed."⁹

Another way of looking at military power would be to recognize it as a deterrence and a reliance on strength to defend one's country and value system. World War I Secretary of War Newton Baker provides some perspective to the problem of having resources dedicated to armaments and armies:

I feel no alarm on the subject of militarism in America. . . . Militarism is a philosophy; it is the

designation given to a selfish or ambitious political system which uses arms as a means of accomplishing its objects. The mobilization and arming of a democracy in defense of the principles on which it is founded... is an entirely different thing.¹⁰

World War II saw the Nation mobilized after Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor. The call then was for "total victory" against both Nazi Germany and Japan; there was little debate over the necessity of such action. But soon after the "total victory" was achieved, pacifists, socialists, and liberals began to see dangers in the extended role given to defense considerations. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas saw great problems with the new emphasis. He warned that as a result of the U.S. military-mindedness there was less room for debate—less room for argument—less room for persuasion—than in almost any period in history.¹¹

Disillusionment with the Vietnam war brought criticism to the U.S. effort to use military force to further the values of freedom and self-determination. The criticism came from those in the highest levels of Government, the people in the urban ghetto, and from the college campuses. It is difficult to determine the motivations for each group's response, but the young people born between 1945 and 1950, the turbulent youth generation of today, do have a rational reason; they have had no authentic experience with war or cold war. Hitler and Stalin are no more to them than historical figures. Thus by their actions it would appear that the noisy representatives of the younger generation are devoid of the historical awareness needed in establishing adequate national defenses and meeting commitments its Government had agreed to around the world. Because these young people have little historical perspective, it is easy to see, as Ray-

94 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

mond Aron has said: "There is a danger that everything will begin all over again because in their eyes everything begins with them."¹²

There is a growing antimilitaristic attitude in the United States today, and it is reflected in the comments of the Nation's leaders. Some examples by those who feel most strongly would include the following statements:

Senator George S. McGovern:

The lessons learned from Vietnam are (1) the new recognition of the limitations of military power and (2) that military judgments are unreliable.¹³

Representative Richard N. Goodwin:

It will not do to blame the generals. Force is their business. It was rather the civilian leadership which created this machine and gave it the tools to justify and explain and provide both the logic of fear and that exotic language of strategic theory which is used to haffle common sense.¹⁴

Retired Gen. William Wallace Ford:

The war in Vietnam has divided our people and weakened our military strength because of that division. You cannot create disenchantment among nearly all the youth of the country and expect to have a strong military posture.¹⁵

Senator Gaylord A. Nelson:

We are reacting badly, as a country, to our young people. We run around asking, "What's wrong with the kids?" It isn't what's wrong with the kids, it's what's wrong with the country. They are reflecting what is wrong with the country. . . . They are sick and

tired of being involved in a war in Vietnam for which we have not yet figured out a purpose. . . . The first issue raised by students in the past years has been Vietnam, because that is immediate and reflects their rejection of the militarization of this and other countries. But the second issue often raised is: What are we doing to the air? What are we doing to the water of the country? What are we doing to the beauty of the nation?¹⁶

Professor Richard A. Falk:

. . . the only positive effect of the Vietnam war has been to give the youth of America an invaluable learning experience. Vietnam has led the young to question why they are being asked to make senseless sacrifices.¹⁷

The young people had indeed been asking why during the sixties. And there is no reason to believe that youth will stop their questioning in the near future.

VI—CONCLUSIONS

College students have demonstrated during the 1960's that they can indeed be a potent force. In the university, attention now is being given to restructuring the entire system. The outcome of this action is still unknown, but the first steps are being taken, and student protests can claim much of the credit. But change in the university is not the aim of the radical New Left. The root causes for student unrest will undoubtedly persist for years to come—including U.S. involvement in Vietnam—and student discontent will therefore remain, with protests against all perceived injustices within society continuing. Whether these protests will be violent and destructive under the

sponsorship of the New Left revolutionaries is not possible to predict with accuracy. However, violence will ultimately prove counterproductive as non-violent activists see the futility of such actions. The collapse of the radical and destructive behavior of the New Left can be hastened if the older generation will commit itself to the ideals of democracy and demonstrate with positive programs that it recognizes the validity of the legitimate grievances in the student protests. Where the immaturity and inexperience of the young people disqualify them from making sound judgments, those in authority should stand firm. Yet every opportunity should be taken to permit youth to assume responsibilities in the areas that affect their personal lives and to include students in the actual decision-making process when their viewpoint will add to the overall worth of such decisions. To err on the side of overrepresentation of students would not be an error. Adults should never forget that youth desperately needs and wants inspired leadership—not from its peers, but from adults. In fact, it will be the responsible adult activist who will inspire youth most. Certainly we must be careful to avoid condemning all protests. Robert Kennedy once said: "We must not tolerate dissent, we must demand it." This theme is vital to maintain a viable society.

The antimilitaristic mood of the Nation today is considered the inevitable outcome of a frustrating and unpopular war. This reaction is natural, and the pendulum will swing back only when Americans perceive a more direct threat to their own borders. Yet, for the Nation's leadership to fail to educate the American people that military assistance, in men, money and material, will be a continuing requirement would be a mistake that could mean the loss of world leadership. Because of the present antimilitaristic mood, a program needs to be developed and fostered which

reminds Americans of the worldwide commitments the United States has undertaken. Although future involvements of American troops abroad will probably require congressional approval and popular support, it will be necessary first to vividly portray the threat and the actual death and destruction of our allies before Americans will be ready to commit themselves to another limited war. And once committed, Americans must be continuously educated to the realities of such warfare; if this is not done, protest similar to those experienced during the Vietnam war will follow. Because each person is a product of his experience, the events that surround the youth of today as they proceed into adulthood will continue to have an impact on their viewpoint for years to come. Today's political leaders came to political consciousness when the concern was to contain fascism and then communism. The perceived threat was convincing. But today's youth visualizes no such threat and has not been convinced of the existence of any threat.

BIOGRAPHIC SUMMARY



Lt. Comdr. Theodore T. Leber, Jr., U.S. Navy, graduated from Northwestern University in 1959 with a degree in journalism. After serving three tours of duty as a supply officer and attending the Naval Transportation Management School in Oakland, Calif., he was assigned to an NROTC unit in Seattle where he served for a year as an Assistant Professor of Naval Science. In this position he experienced firsthand the problems of student protest. Lieutenant Commander Leber is a graduate of the Naval War College's School of Naval Command and Staff and holds the degree of Master of Science in international affairs from The George Washington University. He is presently assigned aboard the U.S.S. *Columbus*.

96 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

Thus, America faces two vital issues in the coming years. First, the validity of the legitimate grievances of youth must be recognized with maximum participation by youth themselves used to correct society's wrongs. We have seen in the sixties that student activism, whether considered the result of or the cause of social discontent, can play a major role in mobilizing students to action. Once activated, small dissident groups are able to stir up much larger audiences because democracy, freedom, and capitalism are not perceived as just in actual practice. Unless a concerted effort is made to resell the efficacy of these ideals and to demonstrate commitment to them, youth will have the ammunition to continue their attack upon society. The conclusion that student protests are only a temporary phenomenon caused by the frustrations of the Vietnam war is not supported by the research done for this paper. Pro-

tests against the military may disappear as the Vietnam war ends and as draft laws are further revised, but activism itself has proved a useful tactic and will not be abandoned rapidly.

Second—and it may be premature to draw this conclusion—it appears that because of the increasingly antimilitaristic mood developing in the United States, America faces the danger of being unprepared for future wars. Defense of our freedom does not come cheaply. Decisions being made today to decrease present defense spending for other important and competing programs must not downplay or eradicate the continuing threat of communism. If our present low-posture foreign policy negates the existence of a threat in the minds of our citizens and if we do not recreate the mandate for maintaining a credible military prepared for the worst, it is easy to foresee a decline of the United States as a world power.

FOOTNOTES

II—OVERVIEW OF STUDENT MOVEMENT

1. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, *Riots, Civil and Criminal Disorders*, Hearings (Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1969), pt. 16, p. 3044.
2. Jack Newfield, "The Beat Generation and the Un-Generation," Patriek Gleeson, ed., *America, Changing . . .* (Columbus, Ohio: Merrill, 1968), p. 263.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 266-267.
4. David Riesman, "Where Is the College Generation Headed?" *The Atlantic*, April 1961, p. 39-45.
5. Gleeson, ed., p. 268-270.
6. Connell Persieo, "Live and Let Live," Otto Butz, ed., *To Make a Difference: a Student Look at America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 110.
7. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., quoted in Gleeson, ed., p. 271.
8. Michael Harrington, "Notes of the Left," *The New Leader*, 22 May 1961, p. 16-17.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Lewis S. Fener, "Youth in the '60's," *The New Leader*, 6 March 1961, p. 20.
11. Andrew Kopkind, "Battle on the Campus," *New Statesman*, 21 October 1966, p. 576.
12. Saunders Redding, "The Black Youth Movement," *The American Scholar*, Autumn 1969, p. 584.
13. Michael Kazin, "Some Notes on S.D.S.," *The American Scholar*, Autumn 1969, p. 650-651.
14. Karl E. Meyer, "Revolt on the Campus," *New Statesman*, 15 January 1965, p. 65.
15. Mario Savio, quoted in Gleeson, ed., p. 274.
16. Jacques Barzun, *The American University* (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 75.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 63-64.
18. Gertrude Stein, quoted in Barzun, p. 76.
19. Edwin Diamoud, "Class of '69, the Violent Years," *Newsweek*, 23 June 1969, p. 70.
20. Senate Committee on Government Operations, pt. 22, p. 4900-4901.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 4943.

22. Daniel Seligman, "A Special Kind of Rebellion," *Fortune*, January 1969, p. 68.
23. *Ibid.*
24. Letter (Enclosure) from the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.: 3 February 1970.
25. Kenneth Keniston, "American Students and the Political Revival," *The American Scholar*, Winter 1962-63, p. 52.
26. Barzun, p. 64-65.
27. Urban Research Corporation, *Student Protests 1969 Summary* (Chicago: 1970), p. 1-40.
28. Trevor Fisk, "The Nature and Causes of Student Unrest," *The Political Quarterly*, October-December 1969, p. 424.
29. Henry F. May, "Living with Crisis: a View from Berkeley," *The American Scholar*, Autumn 1969, p. 596.

III—CAUSES OF STUDENT UNREST

1. John W. Aldridge, "In the Country of the Young," *Harper's*, October 1969, p. 51.
2. Seymour M. Lipset, ed., *Student Politics* (New York: Basic Books, 1967), p. 218-219.
3. Lewis S. Feuer, *The Conflict of Generations* (New York: Basic Books, 1969), p. 7.
4. Bruno Bettelheim, "The Problem of Generations," Gleeson, ed., p. 8-9.
5. George Z. Bereday, "Students and Politics," Lipset, ed., p. 119.
6. Seymour M. Lipset, "American Student Activism," P-3893 (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand, July 1968), p. 9.
7. Kenneth Keniston, "Notes on Young Radicals," *Change in Higher Education*, November-December 1969, p. 25-33.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
9. Seligman, p. 173.
10. Seymour M. Lipset and Philip G. Altbach, "Student Politics and Higher Education in the United States," Lipset, ed., *Student Politics*, p. 218-219.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 219.
12. Gleeson, ed., p. 28.
13. Bob Dylan, quoted in Ilutz, ed., p. 163.
14. Meyer, p. 65.
15. Fisk, p. 421-422.
16. Barzun, p. 71.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 67-69.
18. Lipset, ed., *Student Politics*, p. 212.
19. "Campus '65," *Newsweek*, 22 March 1965, p. 154.
20. Robert H. Somers, "The Berkeley Campus in the Twilight of the Free Speech Movement: Hope or Futility," James McEvoy and Abraham Miller, eds., *Black Power and Student Rebellion* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1969), p. 427.
21. Lipset, ed., p. 227.
22. Urban Research Corporation, p. 1-40.
23. "Briefs," *Change in Higher Education*, November-December 1969, p. 60-61.
24. Herbert Deane, quoted in James S. Kunen, *The Strawberry Statement: Notes of a College Revolutionary* (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 121.
25. Barzun, p. 89.
26. Theodore Newcomb, "University, Heal Thyself," *Political Science Quarterly*, June 1969, p. 351-366.
27. Richard E. Peterson, "The Student Left in American Higher Education," *Daedalus*, Winter 1968, p. 312.
28. Massimo Teodori, ed., *The New Left: a Documentary History* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), p. 125.
29. "Campus '65," p. 53-54.
30. Peterson, p. 293.
31. Philip G. Altbach, "Students and International Affairs," Bruce Douglass, ed., *Reflections on Protest* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1968), p. 77-78.
32. Erik H. Erikson, "Youth: Fidelity and Diversity," Gleeson, ed., p. 16.
33. Teodori, ed., p. 46.
34. Robert Hessen, "What Campus Rebellions Mean to You," *Nation's Business*, June 1969, p. 31-32.
35. "What They Believe," *Fortune*, January 1969, p. 70-71.

98 NAVAL WAR COLLEGE REVIEW

36. Charles Burck, "Student Activists: Free-Form Revolutionaries," *Fortune*, January 1969, p. 108.
37. Peterson, p. 297.
38. Kazin, p. 653.
39. Hessen, p. 30-32.
40. William Thompson, Jr., "Vanishing Liberals," *The Center Magazine*, September 1969, p. 90.
41. Paula Reimer, "SDS: an Experiment in Pragmatism Fails," *New Politics*, Fall 1969, p. 57.
42. Michael Parker, "SDS: Copping out of American Life," *New Politics*, Fall 1969, p. 50.

IV—ANTIMILITARISM ON THE CAMPUS

1. Kenneth E. Boulding, "Reflections on Protest," Douglass, ed., p. 62-65.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 54-55.
3. Jacob R. Fishman and Fredric Solomon, "Youth and Social Action: an Introduction," *The Journal of Social Issues*, October 1964, p. 11.
4. Arnold S. Kaufman, "Teach-Ins: New Force for the Times," *The Nation*, 21 January 1965, p. 667.
5. Teodori, p. 55.
6. Kaufman, p. 667.
7. Douglass, ed., p. 67-68.
8. Steve Weissman, "Lament for the Teach-Ins," *The New Leader*, 27 March 1967, p. 16.
9. Gregory H. Wierzynski, "'Our Most Wrenching Problem Is Finding a Place for Ourselves in Society,'" *Fortune*, January 1969, p. 116.
10. Butz, ed., p. 25.
11. James A. Foley and Robert K. Foley, *The College Scene* (New York: Cowles, 1969), p. 29.
12. J. Bronowski, "Protest—Past and Present," *The American Scholar*, Autumn 1969, p. 538.
13. "50% Uphold Nixon in a Campus Poll," *The New York Times*, 18 December 1969, p. 13:1.
14. Wierzynski, p. 116.
15. Alfred Vagts, *A History of Militarism: Civilian and Military* (New York: Meridian Books, 1959), p. 94.
16. Carl B. Swisher, "The Supreme Court and Conseription," *Current History*, June 1968, p. 351-352.
17. Warren S. Tryon, "The Draft in World War I," *Current History*, June 1968, p. 343.
18. Swisher, p. 353.
19. Tryon, p. 368.
20. James A. Huston, "Selective Service in World War II," *Current History*, June 1968, p. 346.
21. David Osher, "Politics and Strategy of Resistance," *New Politics*, Fall 1969, p. 58-59.
22. Teodori, p. 65.
23. Kazin, p. 648-649.
24. "Student Leaders of Varied Politics Ask End of Draft," *The New York Times*, 6 February 1967, p. 9:2.
25. Allen H. Barton, "The Columbia Crisis," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Fall 1968, p. 348-349.
26. Swisher, p. 365.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 353.
28. U.S. National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, *In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serve?* (Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1967), p. 66.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 12, 15.
32. George E. Reedy, *Who Will Do Our Fighting for Us?* (New York: World, 1969), p. 67-68.
33. "The Redress of Their Grievances," *Ramparts*, December 1967, p. 28.
34. "Deserters' Total Tiny, Says DoD," *Army Times*, 28 January 1970, p. 2:1.
35. U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Armed Services, *Amending and Extending the Draft Law and Related Authorities, Hearings* (Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1967), p. 25.
36. "Dissent within Army Infinitesimal—Westy," *Army Times*, 28 January 1970, p. 10:1.

37. James P. Sterba, "The Hours of Boredom, the Seconds of Terror," *The New York Times Magazine*, 8 February 1970, p. 92-93.
38. U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), *Report of the Special Committee on ROTC to the Secretary of Defense* (Washington: 22 September 1969), p. 10.
39. Arthur A. Ekirch, *The Civilian and the Military* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 218.
40. David Y. Thomas, "Compulsory Military Training in American Colleges," *Current History*, April 1926, p. 29.
41. Ekirch, p. 266.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 224.
43. Charles P. Summerall, "The System Defended," *Current History*, April 1926, p. 31-32.
44. Terry Robbins, *Time of the Furnace: Organizers' Manual for the Spring Offensive*, mimeographed (Cleveland: Ohio Region of the S.D.S., n.d.)
45. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 10.
47. Telephone conversation with Captain Moulthrop, Bureau of Naval Personnel, 19 February 1970.
48. Toby Sackton, "3 Years of Struggle," *The Old Mole*, 22 April-9 May 1969, p. 17:1. Harvard University student "underground" newspaper.
49. Herl Schwarzl, "ROTC: Does It Belong on Campus?" *Alumni Magazine of the University of Pennsylvania*, November 1969, p. 10.
50. Arthur M. Schlesinger, *Nothing Stands Still* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), p. 143.
51. "Students Vote for ROTC," *Army Times*, 26 November 1969, p. A25:1.
52. Schwartz, p. 11.
53. U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), p. 7.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 17-18.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 26-27.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 29-39.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
58. Telephone conversation with Captain Moulthrop, Bureau of Naval Personnel, 19 February 1970.

V—ANTIMILITARISM IN THE UNITED STATES

1. Graham Allison, et al., "Limits to Intervention," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1970, p. 245.
2. Vagts, p. 14.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 76-77.
4. Erwin Knoll and Judith N. McFadden, eds., *American Militarism, 1970* (New York: Viking Press, 1969), p. 135-136.
5. David M. Shoup, "The New American Militarism," *Current*, June 1969, p. 54.
6. John K. Galbraith, *How to Control the Military* (New York: Signet Books, 1969), p. 82-85.
7. William G. Carleton, "Raising Armies before the Civil War," *Current History*, June 1968, p. 331.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 327.
9. Vagts, p. 453.
10. Warren S. Tryon, "Draft in World War I," *Current History*, June 1968, p. 342.
11. Vagts, p. 485.
12. Raymond Aron, "Student Rebellion: Vision of the Future or Echo from the Past?" *Political Science Quarterly*, June 1969, p. 293-294.
13. Knoll and McFadden, eds., p. 59.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 56-57.
17. *Ibid.*

