

cupations. Someday a woman may play tight end for the Baltimore Colts. Then imagine the the spectator interest that would arise over a 15-yard penalty for illegal use of the hands and arms?

Finally there is the stigma of servitude attached to the exclusive use of women in the Playboy centerfold. Equity demands a color centerfold of Joe Namath, stapled in the navel. This will give men a sample of the shame and horror women feel when they are cast in the role of pliable sex objects.

There is one basic reason why women are victims of capitalism, male chauvinism, institutional sexism, imperialism, objectification, Hugh Hefner, psychological deformation, moral mutilation and physical exploitation. The reason? Women have nice bodies, and fortunately, government cannot do much about that.

We are much in need of a conspicuous problem which clearly cannot be solved by government. Some Americans do not

believe such a problem exist. But the soft, warm, intractable fact about women's problems may teach these Americans an invaluable lesson about the very finite capabilities of government.

Women's liberation will not be a gift of government. Women must save themselves. Most important, they must not be betrayed into servility by "Aunt Toms," those collaborationists who trade their birthrights for a mess of service. No woman will be free until all women are willing to step on cockroaches. This is a stern test, but as the philosopher said, if women can't stand the heat they should stay in the kitchen. □

---

George F. Will graduated from Trinity College in 1962, received a degree from Oxford University, Magdalen College in 1964 and earned his Ph. D. from Princeton in 1968. Mr. Will is twenty-nine and instructs physical education in Washington, D.C.

---

to prescribe by threats of force or class disruption how he should teach is a violation of academic freedom. Third, the faculty through its representatives must be continuously involved in the consideration of new problems and challenges to the educational experience; it must keep open all lines of communication among constituent groups of the university community, and work continuously for the establishment of a rational consensus on all matters of common educational concern. UCRA is an association of independent centers which subscribe to the three propositions above.

We are happy that these propositions withstood the acid test of time.

**THE ALTERNATIVE:** You are opposed to militant students then?

**TODOROVICH:** Well, when you scan through the three propositions you see that UCRA is opposed to violence of any kind--intimidation and so on. That's a negative aspect if you wish, but it's only a necessary response to a very real and pressing threat. Now, on the positive side we are for keeping the universities an open place for exchange of ideas because only by keeping it open and not yielding to any dogmatic pressure can the university discharge its duty. And the third proposition--I'm not paraphrasing it in exact sequential order--stipulates that we will do our best to keep all the channels of communication between all the three parts of the university open because only through clear exchange of ideas rather than through arbitrary actions from whatever quarter can a true stability and understanding be brought about. But to come back to your original question I would say of course yes. Violence has no place whatsoever on our campuses--I don't think it has much place anywhere in our society, but we're limiting ourselves to the university. It is almost beyond comprehension that by a certain kind of long drawn argumentations, which I think you know perfectly well, doctrinaire persons who cannot get their views adopted and thus become bitter, justify their recourse to violence as it being the only available option. But this of course goes firstly against the very grain of the democratic process according to which if you are in a minority you are just in a minority and this may look too bad to you, but you have to assume that the only legitimate recourse is to try to persuade the majority by argument--and not by clubs and lead pipes as some militants wanted to do--that your recommendations are worth trying. And secondly, in particular, a university should be a place where every view properly presented has the right to exist--to co-exist--with every other, and only the power of persuasion should be the one which ultimately makes one view more acceptable than the other. Even every heresy should have a way of remaining known and discussed within the academy. I am a physicist and remember vividly that Galileo was at one time considered a heretic. It turned out nevertheless that he was right, and the Pope was, let us say, misinformed.

## A Conversation at the University Centers for Rational Alternatives

*Courage has never been a virtue prominent in the American professor's repertory. In the Golden Days of Klannery and One-Hundred-Percent Americanism when the American Protective Association attempted to bring us together and anti-semitism competed in popular thought with nativism, most professors meekly followed the tides. Even as the bleak winds of Nazism began to howl through Europe the professors did not raise a very resonant hue and cry. Thus we should not expect many of our tweedy-coated tape recorders to act against the barbarians intent on destroying their university. When the more decent of our professors do take action to defend an open university they deserve the energetic support of all thinking students, whether conservative, moderate or liberal.*

*The University Centers for Rational Alternatives was founded by vigorous intellectuals like Sidney Hook who believe freedom and democracy are precious and worth fighting for. Composed of professors of many different political persuasions its members wish to preserve open universities and free inquiry. From reading this interview with UCRA's executive secretary Professor M.M. Todorovich, we hope you will gain an appreciation for their unique place in the contemporary struggle for the campuses and in American history. For information concerning membership in UCRA write UCRA, 110 West 40th Street, New York, New York 10018.*

**THE ALTERNATIVE:** What is the purpose of University Centers for Rational Alternatives?

**PROFESSOR TODOROVICH:** The basic purpose when we started it was to simply arouse the awareness of the profession to a changed situation on our campuses and the need for them--the professors, teachers--to do something about it. We found as we looked around that the confrontation was developing actually into a student-administration game with the faculty just somehow left in the middle, joining sometimes one camp and sometimes the other depending on the type of turmoil. And yet the educational process is essentially shouldered by the faculties and if any hopeful resolution of present difficulties has to come about, it will, in our opinion, materialize after this basic element of the educational process, the faculty, raises its voice and says something in its own way, depending on the local condition. It was immediately clear at the very onset that because of the pluralistic type of our society and of our

educational system there's nothing one can suggest as an overall solution nor is there any recipe for a quick end of troubles. But one can alert people--by cross-referencing them with other places--to what already happened there. Now, of course, you don't do such things only operationally. You like to stand behind something--certain propositions or principles--and so in the first issue of our publication **Measure** Professor Hook wrote a little capsule summary of what--at that time--we saw as the essence of UCRA:

University Centers for Rational Alternatives has no specific program or panacea for the problems of any one troubled campus. It is committed only to three fundamental propositions. First, in a free university all questions are open to inquiry, discussion, and debate: none can be settled by the exercise of violence or by threats of intimidation. Second, any attempt to deprive the qualified scholar and teacher of freedom to determine what he should teach and

But Galileo Gallilei, the precursor of Newton, did not become what he is presently in the esteem of people by carrying a bomb or something like that, but by using reason.

**THE ALTERNATIVE:** What is the composition of your organization? Who are the members?

**TODOROVICH:** Let me put it this way. We first thought the organization to be for all of those who are involved in the educational process. In practice, however, it grew into a predominantly faculty organization. There's a sprinkling of administrators but mostly those who were educators and then in some way graduated to become administrators. One very interesting case in point here is San Francisco State President Hayakawa who was Professor Hayakawa when he first joined the UCRA. And now, some people who are trying to be critical of UCRA use him as proof that UCRA shares the views of a very militant president and so on. Yet as I said, he was a "simple" professor at the time he joined UCRA. On the other hand, we are not actively soliciting administrators because we would never want to look like an arm of any administration. We have, of course, also a sprinkling of graduate students who find that they just don't have a real voice anywhere yet, and since they probably plan to remain committed to teaching and learning they join UCRA even at this early stage. One day maybe we will have even UCRA student-affiliated groups. One is now, I believe, in the embryonic stage in the Boston-Harvard area, but this is a local thing involving people there, and if they wish to have it, this will be fine with us. In this sense our membership has really a dual purpose. We have first a national membership from campuses all across the country and Canada. I think the number of campuses is approximately three hundred now. And by being members of UCRA then teachers register their support for our principles and our positions relative to others. They give also a weight to whatever statement or policy pronouncement is made by the national office. But on the other hand we encourage our members to band together into local campus groups to produce some kind of caucuses of-- if I may say so, enlightened people, enlightened in what the turmoil is all about--and then try to affect the alertness of the faculties so that maybe ad hoc committees or groups can be formed to handle specific problems.

"PROTOCOL NOTES: *The New York Times* (e.g., July 24), in reporting the trial in New Haven for the murder of Alex Rackley, refers throughout to Warren Kimbro, the government witness, as 'Kimbro,' to George Sams, another government witness, as 'Sams'— and to Bobby Seale, head of the Black Panther Party and a co-defendant, as 'Mr. Seale.'"

For a free copy of NATIONAL REVIEW, write: Dept. N, 150 E. 35 Street, N. Y. 10016.

**THE ALTERNATIVE:** Have you had much difficulty organizing and growing?

**TODOROVICH:** Not really, I must say. We started with a moderate goal, as kind of a pilot project in a friendly law office which was available to us after five o'clock when the regular occupants finished their jobs. In a natural way we came to a point where, thanks to the continuous support of our membership we started to produce an impact. I want to emphasize that we are still, today, strongly dependent and supported by the contributions from our members, the faculties of the United States. They are sending us contributions of ten dollars, twenty-five dollars-- whatever they can afford. In that sense there was no difficulty. We just slowly grew and grew and are continuing to grow. And we have in this way sufficient financial support to continue existing



Professor Todorovich

indefinitely. In another way we are not at all happy because the magnitude of the challenge does require a substantially larger response than we are able to generate. We would need to have more means to travel around to talk with our good members directly rather than only through telephone and by mail. We would need more funds to organize regional conferences of our members where they could exchange ideas on the spot, multilaterally rather than bilaterally and through writing. We would need more funds to make wider membership drives. There are still very many people who write letters to us which read as follows: "I accidentally heard about UCRA. Would you please send me more information?" or "I share an issue of *Measure* with somebody else..." And so on. We are beginning to be occasionally mentioned by the various media. In the past we never tried to do anything to cater specifically to the press or other media: whatever we got was purely accidental. While in a certain sense such an approach is good, in another we are generally less known than our record warrants because we are totally understaffed and underdeveloped. We have only two paid employees here and even this happened only after last week. Before that UCRA was run one hundred per cent by voluntary work. So these are difficulties, but I think on the balance such

a regular and normal growth gives us a more solid base on which to stand than if we enjoyed a greater abundance during the early stages. Most members do send us changes of address and a wealth of information about their respective campuses. They obviously want to get our publications, and they read what they get. We are extremely proud that through our publication *Measure* we did succeed in establishing an independent medium through which we can reach three or four thousand people who are on our mailing list and who **Do** read *Measure*. We do not have to depend on the benevolent attitude of the media in order to have something brought to the attention of the profession. To push the argument even further, it is nowadays sometimes worse to be mentioned by some people or publication than not to be mentioned at all. So in this way, we achieved an independence, money-wise as well as publication-wise. And we hope that this gives us a solid base for further pursuit.

**THE ALTERNATIVE:** Have you encountered much hostility from faculty--in particular--and students?

**TODOROVICH:** First of all it's very interesting that there were very few reports of any noticeable student hostility. I would explain this to myself mostly by A) that the number of militant students--those who engage in this kind of thing--is very small. Actually when there are turmoils the number of souls coming to gatherings is a rather sporadic and ad hoc-ish thing. Events build around moods that are mostly rooted in fashionable psychological trends. These moods die away as fast as they come and one generally encounters less prolonged hostility than people would think. It's a minority which really does the vandalism and breaking and so on. The majority is just around, there--perhaps applauding and joining manifestation. But this is how far they go. On the other hand the hard core minority which is really moving events--it is too busy doing "their thing" to have much strength left to vilify UCRA. Now among professors--well, here I would agree that there are a few vociferous souls around, usually those who overspilled from their earlier SDS student days into the ranks of the SDS-type faculty. Still, very little action from these quarters did come our way. Such faculty groups are also not very numerous. One of the most active organizations of whose existence we know--the New University Conference--when counting all members like graduates assistants and such has no more than about nine hundred members. Now this is not a big opponent--if I may call them opponents at all. In addition many of such people, I think, may have drifted quite accidentally into the whole thing. Our initial obstacles were rather of a very different nature. For instance the general suspicion of the profession against anything organized. Professors became professors because they wanted to have a quiet corner where they could think, ponder and come up with some conclusions. □

(To Be Continued in Next Issue)

After Goldwater, the . . .

## Origins of Dissolution

John C. Meyer

Surveying the political scene today one finds fragmentation and disorder on all sides, yet only six years ago the Liberal Establishment was fresh from its greatest triumph, having united Liberal Republicans, trade unionists, white ethnic groups, Negroes, academicians, and even radicals for the defeat of Barry Goldwater. But in the nature of that victory, the discerning eye could see the shape of things to come. It was not a victory for a new coalition espousing a new program, as that of Franklin Roosevelt, but a negative victory. It was a victory for an anti-Goldwater coalition made possible by a campaign of fear and distortion, run not only by the Democrats but also by the media themselves, before which anything the 1970 Nixon-Agnew campaign has been accused of pales into insignificance.

The breakup of such a coalition was inevitable, but it did not simply return American politics to the status quo. With the 1964 election out of the way the growing tensions within the Democratic Party were free to emerge. As it had to face the existential consequences of its theories of half-hearted struggle with Communism abroad and social engineering at home, the Liberal Establishment itself became divided.

However the first split in the anti-Goldwater coalition, that of the radicals, black and white, occurred by the spontaneous choice of these radicals, and so soon after the election it cannot be considered a result of Great Society policies. But it was a result of liberalism, particularly as manifested in the rhetoric and action of the Kennedy administration. Both these strands of radicalism feed on such New Frontier ideas as the "revolution of rising expectations" (often deliberately created both at home and abroad); both are deeply rooted in the attitudes and methods of the civil rights movement.

The liberal intellectuals around Kennedy did not understand that the principle of civil disobedience, though it may occasionally be moral for a few highly disciplined individuals, is destructive of democracy and incompatible with the maintenance of a civilized order over the long term. It is destructive of democracy because the very keystone of democracy is the idea that everyone must respect the results of the decision-making process, and that if one's side loses, one must wait until next time. Demands for instant perfection -- "freedom now" -- usually cannot be satisfied even when the objective sought is inherently legitimate; those who expect such demands to be satisfied completely disable themselves from responsible participation in actual democratic processes which are the best we have, and in many cases the best we are ever likely to have.

Civil disobedience is incompatible with the maintenance of any civilized order,

because it has an inherent tendency to spread -- from the more sophisticated to the less, and from the supporters of one cause to the supporters of all causes. We have already fully experienced the results of the first of these phenomena, but the second has yet to run its full course. True, we are afflicted with Women's Lib, but the opponents of such leftist causes have yet to take it up. If civil disobedience is a legitimate part of the decision-making process, why shouldn't they take it up, and if it is not, then why is it allowed to affect the decisions actually made in our society?

Until 1965 radicalism was not a significant political phenomenon. In that year the Black Power and student radical movements emerged with startling suddenness. Both retained the idea of disobedience to an "unjust" authority, but discarded, or relegated to the tactical plane, the idea of non-violence. Both movements rejected liberal methods, and at least some liberal goals. The Black Power movement led both directly and indirectly to Watts, Newark, and Detroit; student radicalism led to Berkley, Columbia, and San Francisco State. The Black Power movement was made possible by liberals who told Negroes that society owed them whatever they wanted and that they should blame society, not themselves, for all their ills; the student movement was made possible by liberal professors telling students that the American system is so rotten that they are justified in doing whatever is necessary to change it.

While radicalism was growing, liberals became progressively more split, with two groups appearing -- what we may call left, or radical-liberals and center-liberals. The former, concentrated especially in education and the media, became dovish and at least apologists for Black Power; the latter concentrated especially in the governmental, corporate, and union bureaucracies, were more committed to integration and the middle (Johnson) course in Vietnam.

These divisions continue to be reflected in the liberal approach to defense and to the law and order issue. Even when things go to extremes and such cherished liberal values as academic freedom and free speech are under attack from the radicals, the liberals are usually unable to take a strong stand without leadership from outside their own ranks, and even when they do, there are always some who side with the radicals.

This same period saw another, not strictly political, phenomenon, that is, the emergence of the "counter-culture." The term "hippie" and the wide-spread phenomenon to which it refers both became current only in 1965. The same year saw the emergence of the drug cult on campus which has done more than any other single factor to set the campus in opposition to the world outside, and which, of course, tends to bring them in conflict with the law.

"Turn on, tune in, drop out" is just as revolutionary a message in its own way as "burn, baby, burn", and it is far more acceptable to most of its potential audience. It is a rejection of self-discipline, reason, and reality for self-indulgence, irrationality, and illusion. If those who are devotees of the counter-culture simply "did their thing" it might be annoying, but, as believers in individual freedom, conservatives might merely adopt an attitude of tolerance toward them. However, they are wont to "do their own thing" with a disregard of the right (especially property rights) of others who do not happen to share their proclivities. Furthermore, having no commitment to the American, constitutional system, and only a vague, generally left-oriented system of values, they are easily led back into the political arena.

It is but one short step from the non-political hippie to the Abbie Hoffman Yippie, or the nihilist-anarchist Weathermen--or for that matter the Charles Manson-type criminal. When people speak of rejection of "middle-class values" it would be well to remember that, while they may start with sexual taboos, marijuana, and motivation toward material success, there is no basis either in reason or experience to expect the process of rejection to stop short with these values. Rather, history would seem to teach us that many will go on to reject the entire system of self-restraint which civilization imposes on the individual, leaving the natural man, otherwise known as the savage, free and unrestrained.

I believe it was this coming cultural revolution which Goldwater was trying to warn us about when, toward the end of the 1964 campaign, he began to emphasize the "breakdown of morality" in America. At the time I thought it was a false issue, but years later when I was engaged in the struggle with the radicals at Columbia, I remembered his words and knew he had seen deeper and farther than I.

The liberal reaction to the cultural revolution is even more confused and ambiguous than their reaction to the political revolution. Many try to be "with it", while others serve on commissions to study it. Being relativists they cannot say it is bad, and being believers in Progress, they cannot be against the newest trend.

What has happened is that 1964 was the last victory of the Liberal Establishment, because liberalism itself is dying. However, so intertwined is this establishment with the fabric of our society, and so entrenched are liberals in positions of leadership in our society, that the destruction of liberalism threatens to be the destruction of the society itself. This is doubly true because the consequences of liberal policies for the whole society are coming home to roost at the same time that dying liberalism leaves us with a dearth of leadership, moral or political.

So, what should conservatives do? Sit back and say "We told you so; it serves you liberals right; now clean up the mess you have made, or perish in it"? Unfortunately we cannot afford such an attitude, because when the liberals receive their just deserts, it is our cities, our universities, indeed our country which will