



10-3-1969

Alienation of the Campus From National Defense

Lewis F. Powell Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.wlu.edu/powellspeeches>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Education Policy Commons](#), [Military and Veterans Studies Commons](#), [Other Public Affairs](#), [Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lewis F. Powell Jr. Papers. Box 117, Folder 25.

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Lewis F. Powell Jr. Papers at Washington and Lee University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Powell Speeches by an authorized administrator of Washington and Lee University School of Law Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact christensena@wlu.edu.

51/167 9/27/69

Thomas Jefferson Award Speech
Richmond, Virginia
October 3, 1969
Lewis F. Powell, Jr.

ALIENATION OF THE CAMPUS FROM
NATIONAL DEFENSE

When one is honored by his fellow citizens, it is always difficult to make an appropriate response. This is all the more so when I think of the prior recipients of this award - each a distinguished American who has contributed much to the welfare of Virginia and our nation.

But I can and do say "thank you" - with the fullest meaning of these words so long used by civilized man. I can also commend the Old Dominion Chapter, Public Relations Society of America, for the concept of this award ceremony. There is a need, especially in this cynical and irresponsible age, to honor responsible citizenship. I accept the award in this symbolic sense, with deep gratitude.

The award is appropriately named for Thomas Jefferson. Among the great Virginians of his time none exemplified more fully the dedication of self to responsible public service than

he - in intellectual leadership, in law, in government, and in education. It is trite to say - but profoundly true - that what the world needs most today is leadership of the Thomas Jefferson quality.

This is as true on the university campus as it is in government and in international relations. Jefferson recognized, more clearly than most, the relationship between higher education and the success of a government "by and for the people". He foresaw that representative government, with the freedoms he revered, could only be preserved by an informed and public-spirited electorate. This, in turn, could only be created and sustained by education. Holding these views, Jefferson considered that the founding of the University of Virginia was one of his three crowning achievements - sharing equally with his authorship of the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom.

Let us reflect tonight on the role of the university in our national life. As the subject, in its full sweep, is too vast for a single speech, I will narrow the focus to a current issue much in the news: namely, the relationship of the university to national defense policy.

There is, undeniably, a growing alienation on the campus from this policy. Indeed, there is often

a rejection of responsibility for this most fundamental duty of a national government. The most fashionable posture on the avant garde campus, by faculty and students, is militant hostility to the armed services, the Pentagon, and even the "relevance" of a strong national defense. The question which I wish to explore is whether this hostility has reached the point of serious citizen irresponsibility?

Before considering examples, let me define the limits of my inquiry. There are hundreds of colleges and universities, and tens of thousands of professors and students. There is no monolithic attitude on any subject, and a broad spectrum of divergent opinion prevails among and within the universities across the country. On a national basis one may be sure that a great majority of faculty members and students are responsible - whether critical or not. This is conspicuously true here in Virginia where proud traditions are still honored and where, to my knowledge, this alienation has not attained significant proportions.

I therefore use the terms "university" and "the campus" not to criticize indiscriminately, but to identify trends evident on some of the more famous campuses.

Nor am I suggesting - certainly no lawyer would - any limitation on free speech or the right of lawful dissent. The vitality of our democracy can be impaired as quickly by repressing First Amendment freedoms as it can by the opposite extreme of massive irresponsible conduct. Admittedly, it is often difficult to draw the line between these two extremes, especially with respect to issues tainted and distorted by revulsion to the unfortunate Vietnam war.

But my subject tonight relates not to the traditional differences of opinion as to the role and composition of our military forces (where divergent views are both inevitable and wholesome), but to intransigent attitudes of hostility towards the American military establishment and even the concept of national defense. Although I defend the right to hold and express these attitudes, I regard them as irresponsible and seriously detrimental to our country and the Free World.

Let us consider specifically four examples of campus attitudes, namely, with respect to (i) ROTC, (ii) campus recruiting, (iii) defense-related research and development, and (iv) the CIA.

Attack on the ROTC

A prime target has been the Reserve Officer Training Corps program (ROTC). The scope and importance of this program are not widely understood. Citizen control of the military is an American tradition. This is evidenced by the President's status as commander-in-chief, by the Defense Department structure of civilian secretaries and control, by the absence of a permanent general staff, and by assurance of a citizens' army.

This latter goal has been achieved, in major part, through the ROTC, a program which has provided the great majority of the officers of each of our armed services. The statistics are dramatic. West Point, for example, graduates only 750 second lieutenants a year, as compared with some 17,000 who will graduate from Army ROTC. The professional officers entering the Army thus constitute only 4% of the entering officer corps.* It is estimated that some 270,000 students were enrolled last year in the ROTC programs of all services on 330 campuses.

The attack on the ROTC has been led by the prestigious Ivy League schools. On January 30, 1969, the Yale faculty voted

*Time, March 7, 1969.

to strip ROTC of its academic standing and to relegate it to the status of an extracurricular activity. The level of animosity was indicated by a further faculty vote to take away the title of professor from those who teach ROTC courses. The Chairman of the Yale Faculty Committee on the Course of Study said:

"ROTC is like singing in Whiffenpoofs - an activity . . . we don't think merits any academic standing."*

ROTC courses may well need higher quality content, and they are peripheral to the classic liberal arts education. But the same may be said for dozens of other courses in the typical free-wheeling college curriculum.

Moreover, one is struck by the pettiness of a great university faculty taking pains to withdraw the title of professor from those who teach disliked courses. This gratuitous downgrading is to be contrasted with the toleration, and even honoring, of the most radical professors.

Harvard University, followed Yale's example - depriving ROTC of its academic status, stripping instructors of their titles, and even eliminating "descriptions of ROTC courses from the Harvard catalog".**

*New York Times, Jan. 31, 1969, p. 1.

**New York Times, Feb. 5, 1969.

Other Ivy League schools, not to be outdone in proving their abhorance of the military, quickly followed suit. These included Princeton, Columbia, and Dartmouth by a more limited move.*.

At about the same time, several of the universities were installing and accrediting new courses of the most dubious academic merit. Indeed, many of our colleges and universities seem to be stumbling over each other to genuflect to the latest student demand for courses claimed to be "more relevant" by both black and white militant students.**

A chilling example is what happened at Harvard. A course was organized there by students on the uplifting subject of "Radical Social Change". It quickly became the second most popular course in Cambridge, with revolutionary oriented lecturers drawn both from undergraduates and outsiders. A professed aim of the course was to produce "more and better

*New York Times, Feb. 1, 1969 (Dartmouth); New York Times, March 4, 1969 (Princeton); and New York Times, March 21, 1969 (Columbia).

**Andrew F. Brimmer, Negro member of the Federal Reserve Board, recently denounced the new "cult of incompetence" which advocates and accepts curricular changes - not on their merit - but to meet militant student demands. Richmond News Leader, Sept. 6, 1969.

radicals". Not surprisingly "the course carries full academic credit toward a Harvard degree".*

If this distorted sense of values were not so serious, one might find amusing this spectacle of intellectual hypocrisy - the curtailing of academic freedom with respect to long accepted courses in the national interest at the same time that academic freedom is stretched to embrace courses in violence taught by the Eldridge Cleavers.

Frustration of Campus Recruiting

Closely related to the ROTC issue is that of recruiting on the campus by the military services and industries with defense contracts. Militant student groups, with some faculty support, include among their demands the end of all such recruiting. Only a few college administrations have taken publicly the drastic step of denying all access to recruiters** but campus recruiting

*Richmond Times Dispatch, April 19, 1969 (quoting editorial from the Alexandria Gazette); see also editorial Richmond Times Dispatch, April 21, 1969.

**As of April 1, 1969, these were reported to include Los Angeles Harbor College (Wilmington, California), Peabody Conservatory (Baltimore, Maryland), Brooklyn College (Brooklyn, New York), Friends University (Wichita, Kansas) and Queens College (Flushing, New York).

has been severely handicapped by the failure of many campus authorities to afford reasonable opportunities for this legitimate activity.

General Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corps, testified last spring before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Corps was dropping its long-standing requirement of a college degree for officer candidates. He cited as the reason, the increasing hostility to campus recruitment. He further testified that in less than a year there had been 20 demonstrations against Marine recruiting. A far larger number of colleges effectively restricted recruiting by various techniques of noncooperation.*

It is in the national interest for the military services - and for industry serving defense needs - to have access to college-trained men. Equally compelling, one would think, is the right of students to be recruited, to hear the arguments in favor of military service, and to have the opportunity of this type of employment. But too many university authorities, cowed and anxious to buy peace with leftist students and faculties at any price, have failed to provide and protect the First Amendment

*Speech, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Winchester, Va., April 10, 1969.

freedoms of recruiters and the students who wish to hear them. On many of the same campuses which indulge this suppression, public forums and even hospitality are routinely provided for revolutionaries who advocate the overthrow of our form of government, such as the SDS, Black Panthers and Communists.

Refusing Military Research

Another aspect of campus alienation from national defense policy relates to research and development. In World War II, when freedom was threatened by rightist totalitarians, the American academic and scientific communities made vital contributions to the defense of their country. Down through the intervening years the skills and resources of our universities have been essential elements of defense research and development.

Significant benefits have flowed in both directions. Our government, largely through American leadership in scientific and technological developments, has maintained for the western world - now threatened by leftist totalitarians - a precarious peace. The university communities contributed much of the scientific genius required for this effort. They also benefited uniquely from the federal funds which built facilities and sustained the

research. Indeed, our society generally benefited from this responsible partnership in many ways other than national defense. It is unlikely that the great scientific and technological advances of our time, with the infinite variety of resulting civilian products and benefits,* would have been achieved without this joint effort by government and the universities.

But this fruitful partnership now appears to be in danger of being dismantled. It may well become the victim of the blind antimilitarism sweeping many of our campuses.

Student and faculty radicals - indeed all elements of the New Left - have long been in full cry against military research. This is a classic leftist posture towards a democratic process. But what causes concern is the increasing number of nonleftist scholars and scientists who now advocate divorcement of the campus from all arms research.

A one-day "research stoppage", organized by the heads of several MIT departments, occurred on many campuses. More far reaching action has been taken officially at MIT and Stanford, both heavily relied upon by our government. At

*Among the more obvious examples are the civilian uses of atomic energy and the potential benefits to mankind of the space program in all of its aspects.

Stanford, following student sit-ins backed in part by the faculty, the university announced a phasing out of highly classified research by the Stanford Applied Electronics Laboratory. A faculty-student committee at Stanford also recommended that the university sever all connections with the Stanford Research Institute. And at MIT last spring, the undertaking of secret projects was suspended pending a re-evaluation of the Institute's participation, directly and indirectly, in military research.*

The hostility to secret research on the campus reached such intensity that the Defense Department recently cut in half - from some 400 to about 200 - its contracts for such research at our colleges and universities. Although the thrust of the movement has been primarily against secret research, there is an emerging trend against any research - whether secret or not - financed for military or national defense purposes.**

Defaming the CIA

Of all the defense-affiliated efforts, the most hated and reviled on the campus is the CIA. Few universities are

*See New York Times, articles by Walter Sullivan in issues of Feb. 9, 1969 and May 4, 1969.

**Washington Post, May 12, 1969, article by Victor Cohn.

now willing to be associated with its necessary research, and scholars increasingly are disinclined to accept CIA employment.

What, indeed, is the object of all of this irrational venom? Until World War II, the U.S. had no national intelligence service as did other major nations. During that war we were dependent largely upon the English for strategic intelligence, both political and military. Following the war, and to meet a manifest national need, Congress created the CIA as an independent intelligence agency responsible - not to the military - but directly to the President and the Congress.

It is not easy to judge the record of secret intelligence operations. Reasonable men, viewing the history of our time, may disagree as to how well the CIA has discharged its vital responsibility. But it is difficult to comprehend how thoughtful citizens could deny the necessity for such an agency, or the importance of affording it adequate support. And many who attack the CIA, and withhold such support, denounce all American "spying" as evil per se. These same critics rarely - if ever - condemn the vast and ruthless espionage activities of the Soviet Union.

Default in Responsibility

I have spoken now of four examples of withdrawal of support by some universities from important elements of national defense, namely, with respect to ROTC, military and industrial recruiting, research and development, and the CIA. I have not talked about other defense issues which divide the military and the campus, such as ABM and MIRV, bases in Spain, amnesty for draft dodgers, and the level of defense spending.

One may regret, as I do, the trend and especially the hostility of campus opinion against a strong national defense. But much of the hostility has involved matters of opinion, as to which every citizen may express his views in the democratic process of decision making. There is a distinction, however, between expressing and advocating anti-defense views by faculty and students on particular issues, and the taking of affirmative action to weaken or frustrate long established national policy*

*There is a high degree of parallelism between Communist propaganda targets and the favorite defense "whipping boys" on many campuses. Communist parties throughout the world long have sought, by massive and insidious propaganda, to undermine public support for the entire U. S. defense structure. New Left organizations are also in the vanguard of a massive effort to discredit our defense establishment. It may be assumed that most of the faculty and students who go along with this shabby effort are not Communist sympathizers. But one wonders whether they realize the extent to which the erosion of confidence in our armed services - to which they contribute - aids and comforts our enemies.

Or putting it another way, it is one thing for individuals on campus to criticize and dissent. It is something quite different for a university through its faculty or administration, or indeed through informal but concerted action, to deny to our government needed assistance and resources with respect to national preparedness. I do not say this is beyond the limits of permissible dissent. I do suggest that this type of action lacks the degree of mature responsibility which Americans are entitled to expect of their free institutions of higher learning.

The Consequences

The consequences of this alienation are difficult to judge at this time. One may hope, with reason, that the trend now so disturbing will abate without serious harm to our country. There have been other periods in our history of hostility toward the military; there have been pacifist movements; and advocacy of unilateral disarmament. But the scope and intensity of the present movement, accented and escalated by modern communications media, are grounds for genuine concern.

A first casualty could be the American concept of civilian control and orientation of the military. The ROTC, the recruitment of educated civilians into the services, the partnership in defense research between government and the

universities, and even the campus influence on the CIA - all tend significantly to perpetuate our civilian tradition. One would have supposed that the intellectual community, perhaps above all others, would be zealous to strengthen - not weaken - this tradition.

One also would have thought that intellectuals would be in the forefront of those wishing to assure for America an adequate defense, as without such a defense the freedoms which they cherish - including academic freedom - would not long survive. It is puzzling indeed to find so many on the campus oblivious to the lessons of history - lessons as recent and as vivid as the Soviet subjugation of a defenseless Czechoslovakia.*

The ultimate consequence of this anti-militarism, if carried to the extremes advocated by some, could be a serious weakening of America's defense capability. An editorial in Life Magazine spoke of the "highly emotional general attacks on the military establishment . . . with the faculties of some

*There is a view, widely embraced by wishful thinking westerners, that Communism is mellowing and becoming less repressive. Those who hold this view might ponder the articles by Henry Kamm, Moscow bureau chief of the N. Y. Times, written upon his recent return from two years in the Soviet Union. Reprinted, Richmond Times Dispatch, Aug. 17, 1969.

major universities . . . (at) war with the armed forces." The editorial then points out:*

"The real danger is that the current anti-military mood could too easily damage our defense posture, and sap the strength and morale of the armed forces who maintain it."

From the time of Thomas Jefferson, our universities and colleges - whether public or private - have participated in and contributed immeasurably to all that is good in America. They have not been remote and cloistered islands within our society; they have been vital and responsible parts of it.

Now, certainly with respect to national defense, there is dismaying evidence of a departure from this historic role - evidence of withdrawal of support of established national policy. Our country, in this precarious age and confronted by enemies of growing strength, surely must maintain adequate military preparedness. This is a nonpartisan national priority, of concern to every American.

It is self evident that our country - its moral influence in the world as well as its military capabilities - will suffer grievously if our government should be denied, on a broad scale, access to the resources of our universities. It is equally

*Life Magazine, March 21, 1969, p. 38.

clear that the universities themselves will suffer irreparable damage. A great source of the strength and vitality of our free institutions has been responsible participation, both corporate and individual, at all levels of government and community activity. The retreat on some campuses from this responsibility is no longer inconsequential. It relates to the most fundamental duty of government, namely, "to provide for the common defense".* Let us hope, in the interest of our country, that this disquieting trend will soon be reversed.

*Preamble, Constitution of the United States.

**ALIENATION OF THE CAMPUS
FROM NATIONAL DEFENSE**

Address Before

The Old Dominion Chapter

Public Relations Society of America

October 3, 1969

by

LEWIS F. POWELL, JR.



United Virginia
Bankshares

Meaningful addresses do not come daily. This speech was delivered by Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Hunton, Williams, Gay, Powell & Gibson, on the occasion he was given the Thomas Jefferson Award by the Old Dominion Chapter, Public Relations Society of America. Mr. Powell is a director of a number of corporations and a most concerned citizen.

Mr. Powell is General Counsel and a Director of United Virginia Bankshares. We are pleased to present the viewpoint to which he alerts us.

J. Harvie Wilkinson, Jr.
President

United Virginia Bankshares Incorporated
and
Chairman of the Board
United Virginia Bank/State Planters
Richmond, Virginia

ALIENATION OF THE CAMPUS FROM NATIONAL DEFENSE

When one is honored by his fellow citizens, it is always difficult to make an appropriate response. This is all the more so when I think of the prior recipients of this award—each a distinguished American who has contributed much to the welfare of Virginia and our nation.

But I can and do say “thank you”—with the fullest meaning of these words so long used by civilized man. I can also commend the Old Dominion Chapter, Public Relations Society of America, for the concept of this award ceremony. There is a need, especially in this cynical and irresponsible age, to honor responsible citizenship. I accept the award in this symbolic sense, with deep gratitude.

The award is appropriately named for Thomas Jefferson. Among the great Virginians of his time none exemplified more fully the dedication of self to responsible public service than he—in intellectual leadership, in law, in government, and in education. It is trite to say—but profoundly true—that what the world needs most today is leadership of the Thomas Jefferson quality.

This is as true on the university campus as it is in government and in international relations. Jefferson recognized, more clearly than most, the relationship between higher

education and the success of a government "by and for the people". He foresaw that representative government, with the freedoms he revered, could only be preserved by an informed and public-spirited electorate. This, in turn, could only be created and sustained by education. Holding these views, Jefferson considered that the founding of the University of Virginia was one of his three crowning achievements—sharing equally with his Presidency and his authorship of the Declaration of Independence.

Let us reflect tonight on the role of the university in our national life. As the subject, in its full sweep, is too vast for a single speech, I will narrow the focus to a current issue much in the news: namely, the relationship of the university to national defense policy.

There is, undeniably, a growing alienation on the campus from this policy. Indeed, there is often a rejection of responsibility for this most fundamental duty of a national government. The most fashionable posture on the avant garde campus, by faculty and students, is militant hostility to the armed services, the Pentagon, and even the "relevance" of a strong national defense. The question which I wish to explore is whether this hostility has reached the point of serious citizen irresponsibility?

Before considering examples, let me define the limits of my inquiry. There are hundreds of colleges and universities, and tens of thousands of professors and students. There is no monolithic attitude on any subject, and a broad spectrum of divergent opinion prevails among and within the uni-

versities across the country. On a national basis one may be sure that a great majority of faculty members and students are responsible—whether critical or not. This is conspicuously true here in Virginia where proud traditions are still honored and where, to my knowledge, this alienation has not attained significant proportions.

I therefore use the terms "university" and "the campus" not to criticize indiscriminately, but to identify trends evident on some of the more famous campuses.

Nor am I suggesting—certainly no lawyer would—any limitation on free speech or the right of lawful dissent. The vitality of our democracy can be impaired as quickly by repressing First Amendment freedoms as it can by the opposite extreme of massive irresponsible conduct. Admittedly, it is often difficult to draw the line between these two extremes, especially with respect to issues tainted and distorted by revulsion to the unfortunate Vietnam war.

But my subject tonight relates not to the traditional differences of opinion as to the role and composition of our military forces (where divergent views are both inevitable and wholesome), but to intransigent attitudes of hostility towards the American military establishment and even the concept of national defense. Although I defend the right to hold and express these attitudes, I regard them as irresponsible and seriously detrimental to our country and the Free World.

Let us consider specifically four examples of campus attitudes, namely, with respect to (i) ROTC, (ii) campus recruiting, (iii) defense-related research and development, and (iv)

the Central Intelligence Agency.

Attack on the ROTC

A prime target has been the Reserve Officer Training Corps program (ROTC). The scope and importance of this program are not widely understood. Citizen control of the military is an American tradition. This is evidenced by the President's status as commander-in-chief, by the Defense Department structure of civilian secretaries and control, by the absence of a permanent general staff, and by assurance of a citizens' army.

This latter goal has been achieved, in major part, through the ROTC, a program which has provided the great majority of the officers of each of our armed services. The statistics are dramatic. West Point, for example, graduates only 750 second lieutenants a year, as compared with some 17,000 who will graduate from Army ROTC. The professional officers entering the Army thus constitute only 4% of the entering officer corps.* It is estimated that some 270,000 students were enrolled last year in the ROTC programs of all services on 330 campuses.

The attack on the ROTC has been led by the prestigious Ivy League schools. On January 30, 1969, the Yale faculty voted to strip ROTC of its academic standing and to relegate it to the status of an extracurricular activity. The level of animosity was indicated by a further faculty vote to take away the title of professor from those who teach ROTC courses. The Chairman of the Yale Faculty Committee on the Course of Study said:

*Time, March 7, 1969.

"ROTC is like singing in Whiffenpoofs—an activity . . . we don't think merits any academic standing."*

ROTC courses may well need higher quality content, and they are peripheral to the classic liberal arts education. But the same may be said for dozens of other courses in the typical free-wheeling college curriculum.

Moreover, one is struck by the pettiness of a great university faculty taking pains to withdraw the title of professor from those who teach disliked courses. This gratuitous downgrading is to be contrasted with the toleration, and even honoring, of the most radical professors.

Harvard University, followed Yale's example—depriving ROTC of its academic status, stripping instructors of their titles, and even eliminating "descriptions of ROTC courses from the Harvard catalog".**

Other Ivy League schools, not to be outdone in proving their abhorance of the military, quickly followed suit. These included Princeton, Columbia, and Dartmouth by a more limited move.***

At about the same time, several of the universities were installing and accrediting new courses of the most dubious academic merit. Indeed, many of our colleges and universities seem to be stumbling over each other to genuflect to the latest student demand for courses claimed to be "more relevant" by both black and white mili-

*New York Times, Jan. 31, 1969, p. 1.

**New York Times, Feb. 5, 1969.

***New York Times, Feb. 1, 1969 (Dartmouth); New York Times, March 4, 1969 (Princeton); and New York Times, March 21, 1969 (Columbia).

tant students.*

A chilling example is what happened at Harvard. A course was organized there by students on the uplifting subject of "Radical Social Change". It quickly became the second most popular course in Cambridge, with revolutionary oriented lecturers drawn both from undergraduates and outsiders. A professed aim of the course was to produce "more and better radicals". Not surprisingly "the course carries full academic credit toward a Harvard degree".**

If this distorted sense of values were not so serious, one might find amusing this spectacle of intellectual hypocrisy—the curtailing of academic freedom with respect to long accepted courses in the national interest at the same time that academic freedom is stretched to embrace courses in violence taught by the Eldridge Cleavers.

Frustration of Campus Recruiting

Closely related to the ROTC issue is that of recruiting on the campus by the military services and industries with defense contracts. Militant student groups, with some faculty support, include among their demands the end of all such recruiting. Only a few college administrations have taken publicly the drastic step of denying all access

*Andrew F. Brimmer, Negro member of the Federal Reserve Board, recently denounced the new "cult of incompetence" which advocates and accepts curricular changes—not on their merit—but to meet militant student demands. *Richmond News Leader*, Sept. 6, 1969.

***Richmond Times-Dispatch*, April 19, 1969 (quoting editorial from the *Alexandria Gazette*); see also editorial *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, April 21, 1969.

to recruiters,* but campus recruiting has been severely handicapped by the failure of many campus authorities to afford reasonable opportunities for this legitimate activity.

General Chapman, Commandant of the Marine Corps, testified last spring before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the Corps was dropping its long-standing requirement of a college degree for officer candidates. He cited as the reason, the increasing hostility to campus recruitment. He further testified that in less than a year there had been 20 demonstrations against Marine recruiting. A far larger number of colleges effectively restricted recruiting by various techniques of noncooperation.**

It is in the national interest for the military services—and for industry serving defense needs—to have access to college-trained men. Equally compelling, one would think, is the right of students to be recruited, to hear the arguments in favor of military service, and to have the opportunity of this type of employment. But too many university authorities, cowed and anxious to buy peace with leftist students and faculties at any price, have failed to provide and protect the First Amendment freedoms of recruiters and the students who wish to hear them. On many of the same campuses which indulge this suppression, public forums and even

*As of April 1, 1969, these were reported to include Los Angeles Harbor College (Wilmington, California), Peabody Conservatory (Baltimore, Maryland), Brooklyn College (Brooklyn, New York), Friends University (Wichita, Kansas) and Queens College (Flushing, New York).

**Speech, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Winchester, Va., April 10, 1969.

hospitality are routinely provided for revolutionaries who advocate the overthrow of our form of government, such as the SDS, Black Panthers and Communists.

Refusing Military Research

Another aspect of campus alienation from national defense policy relates to research and development. In World War II, when freedom was threatened by rightist totalitarians, the American academic and scientific communities made vital contributions to the defense of their country. Down through the intervening years the skills and resources of our universities have been essential elements of defense research and development.

Significant benefits have flowed in both directions. Our government, largely through American leadership in scientific and technological developments, has maintained for the western world—now threatened by leftist totalitarians—a precarious peace. The university communities contributed much of the scientific genius required for this effort. They also benefited uniquely from the federal funds which built facilities and sustained the research. Indeed, our society generally benefited from this responsible partnership in many ways other than national defense. It is unlikely that the great scientific and technological advances of our time, with the infinite variety of resulting civilian products and benefits,* would have been achieved without this joint effort by government and

* Among the more obvious examples are the civilian uses of atomic energy and the potential benefits to mankind of the space program in all of its aspects.

the universities.

But this fruitful partnership now appears to be in danger of being dismantled. It may well become the victim of the blind anti-militarism sweeping many of our campuses.

Student and faculty radicals—indeed all elements of the New Left—have long been in full cry against military research. This is a classic leftist posture towards a democratic process. But what causes concern is the increasing number of nonleftist scholars and scientists who now advocate divorcement of the campus from all arms research.

A one-day "research stoppage", organized by the heads of several MIT departments, occurred on many campuses. More far reaching action has been taken officially at MIT and Stanford, both heavily relied upon by our government. At Stanford, following student sit-ins backed in part by the faculty, the university announced a phasing out of highly classified research by the Stanford Applied Electronics Laboratory. A faculty-student committee at Stanford also recommended that the university sever all connections with the Stanford Research Institute. And at MIT last spring, the undertaking of secret projects was suspended pending a re-evaluation of the Institute's participation, directly and indirectly, in military research.*

The hostility to secret research on the campus reached such intensity that the Defense Department recently cut in half—from some 400 to about 200—its contracts for such research at our colleges and universi-

* See New York Times, articles by Walter Sullivan in issues of Feb. 9, 1969 and May 4, 1969.

ties. Although the thrust of the movement has been primarily against secret research, there is an emerging trend against any research—whether secret or not—financed for military or national defense purposes.*

Defaming the CIA

Of all the defense-affiliated efforts, the most hated and reviled on the campus is the CIA. Few universities are now willing to be associated with its necessary research, and scholars increasingly are disinclined to accept CIA employment.

What, indeed, is the object of all of this irrational venom? Until World War II, the U.S. had no national intelligence service as did other major nations. During that war we were dependent largely upon the English for strategic intelligence, both political and military. Following the war, and to meet a manifest national need, Congress created the CIA as an independent intelligence agency responsible—not to the military—but directly to the President and the Congress.

It is not easy to judge the record of secret intelligence operations. Reasonable men, viewing the history of our time, may disagree as to how well the CIA has discharged its vital responsibility. But it is difficult to comprehend how thoughtful citizens could deny the necessity for such an agency, or the importance of affording it adequate support. And many who attack the CIA, and withhold such support, denounce all American "spying" as evil per se. These same critics rare-

*Washington Post, May 12, 1969, article by Victor Cohn.

ly—if ever—condemn the vast and ruthless espionage activities of the Soviet Union.

Default in Responsibility

I have spoken now of four examples of withdrawal of support by some universities from important elements of national defense, namely, with respect to ROTC, military and industrial recruiting, research and development, and the CIA. I have not talked about other defense issues which divide the military and the campus, such as ABM and MIRV, bases in Spain, amnesty for draft dodgers, and the level of defense spending.

One may regret, as I do, the trend and especially the hostility of campus opinion against a strong national defense. But much of the hostility has involved matters of opinion, as to which every citizen may express his views in the democratic process of decision making. There is a distinction, however, between expressing and advocating anti-defense views by faculty and students on particular issues, and the taking of affirmative action to weaken or frustrate long established national policy.*

*There is a high degree of parallelism between Communist propaganda targets and the favorite defense "whipping boys" on many campuses. Communist parties throughout the world long have sought, by massive and insidious propaganda, to undermine public support for the entire U. S. defense structure. New left organizations are also in the vanguard of a massive effort to discredit our defense establishment. It may be assumed that most of the faculty and students who go along with this shabby effort are not Communist sympathizers. But one wonders whether they realize the extent to which the erosion of confidence in our armed services—to which they contribute—aids and comforts our enemies.

Or putting it another way, it is one thing for individuals on campus to criticize and dissent. It is something quite different for a university through its faculty or administration, or indeed through informal but concerted action, to deny to our government needed assistance and resources with respect to national preparedness. I do not say this is beyond the limits of permissible dissent. I do suggest that this type of action lacks the degree of mature responsibility which Americans are entitled to expect of their free institutions of higher learning.

The Consequences

The consequences of this alienation are difficult to judge at this time. One may hope, with reason, that the trend now so disturbing will abate without serious harm to our country. There have been other periods in our history of hostility toward the military; there have been pacifist movements; and advocacy of unilateral disarmament. But the scope and intensity of the present movement, accented and escalated by modern communications media, are grounds for genuine concern.

A first casualty could be the American concept of civilian control and orientation of the military. The ROTC, the recruitment of educated civilians into the services, the partnership in defense research between government and the universities, and even the campus influence on the CIA—all tend significantly to perpetuate our civilian tradition. One would have supposed that the intellectual community, perhaps above all others, would be zealous to strengthen—not weaken—this tradition.

One also would have thought that intellectuals would be in the forefront of those wishing to assure for America an adequate defense, as without such a defense the freedoms which they cherish—including academic freedom—would not long survive. It is puzzling indeed to find so many on the campus oblivious to the lessons of history—lessons as recent and as vivid as the Soviet subjugation of a defenseless Czechoslovakia.*

The ultimate consequence of this anti-militarism, if carried to the extremes advocated by some, could be a serious weakening of America's defense capability. An editorial in Life Magazine spoke of the "highly emotional general attacks on the military establishment . . . with the faculties of some major universities . . . (at) war with the armed forces." The editorial then points out:**

"The real danger is that the current anti-military mood could too easily damage our defense posture, and sap the strength and morale of the armed forces who maintain it."

From the time of Thomas Jefferson, our universities and colleges—whether public or private—have participated in and contributed

*There is a view, widely embraced by wishful thinking westerners, that Communism is mellowing and becoming less repressive. Those who hold this view might ponder the articles by Henry Kamm, Moscow bureau chief of the N. Y. Times, written upon his recent return from two years in the Soviet Union. Reprinted, Richmond Times Dispatch, Aug. 17, 1969.

**Life Magazine, March 21, 1969, p. 38.

immeasurably to all that is good in America. They have not been remote and cloistered islands within our society; they have been vital and responsible parts of it.

Now, certainly with respect to national defense, there is dismaying evidence of a departure from this historic role—evidence of withdrawal of support of established national policy. Our country, in this precarious age and confronted by enemies of growing strength, surely must maintain adequate military preparedness. This is a nonpartisan national priority, of concern to every American.

It is self evident that our country—its moral influence in the world as well as its military capabilities—will suffer grievously if our government should be denied, on a broad scale, access to the resources of our universities. It is equally clear that the universities themselves will suffer irreparable damage. A great source of the strength and vitality of our free institutions has been responsible participation, both corporate and individual, at all levels of government and community activity. The retreat on some campuses from this responsibility is no longer inconsequential. It relates to the most fundamental duty of government, namely, "to provide for the common defense".* Let us hope, in the interest of our country, that this disquieting trend will soon be reversed.

* Preamble, Constitution of the United States.