

Exclusive Interview with General Westmoreland. See page four.

# The Primary Source

VOLUME 1 NUMBER 8

TUFTS UNIVERSITY

MAY, 1983

## Ballou "Sit-In" Shows Greater Intolerance at Tufts

Ian Ballou, A'83

The issue was not Peter Dreier, although a number of demonstrators claimed it was. What then prompted 250 people to occupy Tufts University's administrative building for over three days last month? As with most political events I have observed during my four years here, the Peter Dreier tenure case and the subsequent "sit-in" are examples of how misconceptions and misnomers become enshrined as truths at this university.

The "sit-in" began because Assistant Sociology Professor Peter Dreier was denied tenure. According to the flyers advertising the "sit-in", "the students of Tufts University" organized the event. This is the first misconception.

The rally was organized by the Tufts Political Action Committee (TPAC) members who had organized recent rallies against the Solomon Amendment and in favor of a Nuclear Free Zone. The cast of characters was similar: the same TPAC leaders, the West African

Drum Ensemble, and the usual sprinkling of professors who have in many cases been the brain-children of some of the more radical activities occurring on this campus. Then their fellow Progressive Student Network (PSN) members from Harvard and Boston

students apparently were unaware that every course evaluation form we fill out is used in the tenure process. Students may also write letters of recommendations. Some TPAC members did this, but were unable to change President Mayer's decision.

disclosed much information about the case. Dreier had recommendations from leftist political leaders, and many implied this demonstrated his academic credentials. If Dreier had been denied tenure because he was a left-wing political organizer despite solid academic credentials, then the demonstrators would have had a case. In fact, there is nothing to suggest this.

The issue wasn't Jean Mayer's decision. Many claimed that they wanted to demonstrate their sentiments to the Administration. A campus vote would have sufficed, although it would have been far less dramatic. More importantly, there would have been no assurance that TPAC could have won such a vote. One person who "sat-in" and who is not a member of TPAC told me, "I'm sure most of the people on this campus don't have any opinion on this issue. I'd bet that a majority of those who do, however, are inside Ballou." For all the votes they took inside Ballou to determine strategy, the demonstrators' claim that they represented "the students of Tufts

continued on page 7



University joined in, and the press was alerted.

The demonstrators demanded a say in the tenure process. Most of the

Despite guarantees of secrecy to protect those people whose recommendations were sought, TPAC and certain professors

## "U.S. OUT OF EL SALVADOR" DISREGARDS LIBERTY

Daniel Calingaert, A'86

El Salvador has, for the past three and one half years, been struggling to reverse its long history of autocracy. The attempts to redistribute land and liberalize the political system have incurred violent retribution from both right-wing and left-wing extremists. Though the process of change has been turbulent, if the government stands firm on its commitments, the goals set at the beginning of this period of reform hold good prospects of being realized.

On October 15, 1979, a group of middle-level army officers overthrew the right-wing dictator General Romero. The leaders of the coup, intent on preventing abuses of power by the government, threw out two-thirds of their senior officers and committed the country to a program of social reform and to a transition towards democracy.

In March 1980, the new government enacted the land

reform program that would redistribute farm lands from the wealthy land owners to the tillers. The right-wing death squads responded by stepping up the violence, attacking even moderates who supported the reform program.

In the meantime, various left-wing extremists groups came together in Havana to form the United Revolutionary Directorate (DRU). Fearful that the land reform program would undermine its public support, the DRU decided to attempt to seize power quickly through a strategy of major offensives. The DRU called for general strikes three times, in June, July and August of 1980. The first remained inconclusive, the second was postponed and the third, despite all-out efforts by the guerrillas to prevent people from going to work — bombing work places and disrupting transportation — was a total failure. On January 10, 1981, the DRU decided to launch a final offensive. Broadcasting from a radio station in Nicaragua, the guerrillas proclaimed that "the decisive hour has come to initiate the decisive military and insurrectional battles for the seizure of power." The people again ignored the guerrillas' calls for support, and the offensive was eventually put down.

The left-wing coalition then reorganized, calling itself the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN). It decided to seek negotiations, but explicitly stated that its objective was to "gain time in order to

improve our internal military situation." To put pressure on the government, the guerrillas began a sabotage campaign designed to cripple the economy. In March 1982, the guerrillas made a major effort to disrupt the elections. They blew up buses, threatened drivers who would carry voters to the polls, attempted to prevent the distribution of gasoline to the eastern part of the country, printed propaganda intimidating voters and even attacked polling places.

Despite the FMLN's repeated calls on the people to boycott the elections, more than 80% of all eligible Salvadorans voted.

The army has been beset by problems in fighting the war due to its failure to utilize effective anti-guerrilla tactics. The National Guard maintains its garrisons near large towns while keeping small outposts in rural villages. The outposts typically consist of ten to fifteen soldiers, commanded by a

continued on page 8



(Photograph by Michael Finch)

On Wednesday, April 13, 1983 in Cabot Auditorium, John H. Sumnu, Governor of New Hampshire and Tufts Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering, addressed an audience on his experiences "From Tufts to the State House." He returned to Tufts to receive *The Primary Source's* award for Tufts' Conservative of the Year, 1982.

### In This Issue

- From The Editor, page 2
- Letters, page 3
- Memo to Mayer, page 2
- Monetarism's Demise, page 3
- On the Right, page 7
- Professor's Row: Music Professor Mark DeVoto, page 3
- Westmoreland Interview, page 4

# From The Editor

## TUFTS ISSUES NEVER DIE, THEY JUST FADE AWAY

As the 1982-3 school year comes to a close, it is important to reflect on the controversial issues that have faced this university and make a

### Gratuities

The creation and realization of *The Primary Source* has been a difficult and often frustrating process. We must continuously resist those who would rather not have a conservative publication at Tufts: the politically narrow-minded and insecure, the entrenched bureaucrats here, and, worst of all, the ignorant.

But the success of *The Primary Source* would have been impossible without the assistance and support of the following individuals who provided their unique skills regardless of their political beliefs:

Mr. Richard Arum  
Mrs. Kathy Watson Baker  
Mr. Curtis Barnes  
Mr. Kenny Beck  
Ms. Diane Bessette  
Mr. Morton C. Blackwell  
Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr.  
Mr. Tom DeCair  
Mrs. Midge Decter  
Professor Henry Delfiner  
Mr. Bill DeOre  
Professor Mark DeVoto  
Ms. Eve DuBrow  
Larry Ellswit, Esq.  
Mrs. Christine Flanagan  
Mr. Christopher Flannery  
Mr. Charles Freeman  
Professor Ivan Galantic  
Professor Ann Hendricks  
Mr. Bill Herman  
Mr. Ken Jenson  
Mr. Ted Higgins  
Mr. Art Kaufman  
Dean Bobbie Knable  
Mrs. Rita Kramer  
Mr. Andrew Lane  
Mr. Jon Levy  
Ms. Debbie Malmud  
Mr. Philip Marcus  
Ms. Amy Moritz  
Dean John Roche  
Ms. Michele Rossi  
Martin Silfin, Esq.  
Mr. Chris Silva  
Ms. Judith Silvertan  
The Honorable John Sununu  
Mr. Michael Sussman  
Mr. Scott Trudeau  
Mr. Richard Vaughan  
General William Westmoreland  
Mr. Gene Zelazny

We appreciate their commitment to freedom of political expression and their help in creating a conservative voice at Tufts. As conservatives have always believed, individuals are the key to the success of our nation. *The Primary Source* "project" clearly exemplifies their impact, for the power of *The Primary Source*, like the individual, is an idea whose time has come.

Finally, we would like to express our best wishes to the members of *The Primary Source* who are graduating this year. Congratulations to Christine Greenlees and Peter DeCaprio.

We would like separately to acknowledge Ian Ballon. Without his input during his four years here, the impetus for *The Primary Source* might never have existed. His impact as conservative advocate and good friend will be long remembered.

few conclusions as to where we've gone and where we should go from here.

- 1. ROTC Club:** It is a credit to the leaders of the Reserve Officers Training Corp (ROTC) Club and some of the Tufts Community Union (TCU) Senators that the ROTC Club will finally be able to utilize campus facilities for its classes. Let's hope we can soon reintegrate ROTC into the university so it is no longer a club but a thriving, integral department in the University.
- 2. The Solomon Amendment:** The Mayer Administration has correctly promised to ensure that, in accordance with the law, those who do not participate in draft registration will not receive federal student loans. Although President Mayer's concerns may be more financial than moral, we commend his efforts nonetheless.
- 3. Divestment:** It is unclear what, if anything, the Trustees decided to do about the Tufts Political Action Coalition's (TPAC) request that the University divest from all corporations that participate in any way with the production of nuclear arms. We just hope the Trustees realize that it is their responsibility to maintain the fiscal solvency of this University first and foremost.
- 4. Tufts As A Nuclear Free Zone:** This bogus issue is a result of a bogus referendum in which

only about 25% of the campus voted. Nuclear arms research is important and should be pursued by the University. As for the transportation of nuclear arms at Tufts, I think we have very little to be worried about.

- 5. TuftsPIRG's Funding:** Thanks to the TCU Judiciary's decision that the Tufts Public Interest Research Group's (TuftsPIRG) referendum is unconstitutional because it usurps the Senate and the Allocation Board (ALBO) of their power to allocate money to student organizations, TuftsPIRG (and hence MassPIRG, Inc.) finally went to the Senate directly for funding. And it did quite well: \$12,350 of a \$26,400 budget. Comparing what it asked for with what it received, this seems fair, but the budget included such unnecessary items as a Tufts Organizer (Kathy Watson Baker is supposed to be all organizations' organizer) and Campus Support Staff that includes a Publications Director to, as TuftsPIRG described, "put out the MassPIRG Report, PIRG Week, and project reports." In other words, the Senate still has us paying for the activities of MassPIRG, Inc. And this seems especially unfair when you compare TuftsPIRG's budget with other organizations here; TuftsPIRG receives *twice as much* money as Crew, Men's Volleyball, Softball, Hockey,

Women's Rugby, and Men's Rugby received *combined*, and *three times* what Peer Counseling, Boston School of Occupational Therapy, Black Outreach and TPAC received *combined*.

Naturally, I have omitted many important issues. For instance, I have not mentioned *The Observer's* April Fool's issue. But this is a controversy for the TCU Senate and the Committee on Student Life to decide. And as for the Ballou Hall "sit-in", frankly it is not an issue but only a theatrical event.

Next year, I'm sure the list of important issues will expand, but many of these same controversies will still remain unresolved. All I can hope is that in the coming year we may continue to have impact, so we may solve these issues the *right* way one by one, once and for all.

### The Primary Source

Editor Daniel Marcus  
Associate Editor Brian Kelley

#### Staff Writers

Ian Ballon  
Daniel Calingaert  
George Danas  
Peter DeCaprio  
Michael Finch  
John Galantic  
Monique Gaudette  
Christine Greenlees  
Douglas Shooker  
Melanie Sturm

Advisor Henry Delfiner, Ph.D

Address letters to:  
*The Primary Source*  
P.O. Box 14  
Tufts University Station  
Medford, Massachusetts 02153

The editors encourage your correspondence. Due to limitations in space, we will attempt to print letters addressing a wide spectrum of topics raised in each issue.

This publication does not necessarily represent the opinions of the Tufts University administration.

*The Primary Source* is a recognized organization at Tufts University. It is registered with the Student Activities Office.

## Letters On Travels to the USSR

Douglas Shooker's poor use of sarcasm, obvious preconceptions and ideological rigidity detract from whatever journalistic merit that his article "A Student's Perspective of the Soviet Union" (April, 1983) might have ever had. His tainted observations and conclusions present a simplified and trivialized view of a nation that is far beyond the comprehension of most.

His criticisms rely heavily upon comparing the domestic situation in the Soviet Union with that in the United States. Although this technique is a favorite of ideologues in both the East and the West, it is nevertheless invalid. If you really want to find the weak points in the Soviet system, look for the inconsistencies between what they say and what the reality is. I do not refer to such things as the empty rhetoric of the Party line, which one can find everywhere, but to the realities of life in Russia. Here the opportunities are many for exposing the Soviet Union for the inefficient and façade-covered state that it is. It claims economic strength and growth, but the black market is

perhaps the largest national industry.

I also feel that Mr. Shooker's experience is far from typical. I myself had no trouble doing things on my own. We went to the ballet, had a vodka and caviar dinner in Moscow and met S---- in Leningrad, who told us more about the life of the average urban Russian than we could have learned anywhere else. The people that I met were friendlier than many Europeans, even with an almost insurmountable language barrier.

Mr. Shooker apparently made no attempt to learn from this experience that he was lucky to have, or even to objectively report on what he saw. He saw only what confirmed his prejudices and did not seem to realize that he was, after all, a stranger in a *very* strange land. Have you ever talked to a European who has come through U.S. immigration? Perhaps you would understand what I mean if you had.

I would agree with him that everyone should have the chance to visit the Soviet Union, but for very

continued on page 3

### ADVERTISING POLICY

*The Primary Source*, as Tufts' conservative voice, has a responsibility to provide advertising space to any organization or individual. Therefore, we will publish the text of any political advertisement that espouses the beliefs of this publication.

For advertising rates, please write to *The Primary Source*, P.O. Box 14, Tufts University Station, Medford, MA 02153.

## PROFESSOR'S ROW

# Musical Conservatism in the Twentieth Century

Professor Mark DeVoto

I dislike the idea of conserving, of keeping in cans. The conservative bores us, I might add, when he tries to stop new things from growing, while the radical bores us when he begins to shout, "Look here, see how radical I am!"

The most famous composer of our century, Igor Stravinsky, was 76 years old when he made this statement. (Nor, it might be added, had he ever studied at a conservatory.) In his long and vigorous career he achieved and sustained a success such as few other composers have enjoyed; when he died in 1971, age 88 and wealthy, he was honored by three generations of composers, performers, and other artists all over the world. He had never

waited for recognition; his ballet, *The Firebird* (1910), completed when he was 28 years old, instantly

work, *Petrushka*, and his next ballet, *The Rite of Spring* (1913), remains for all time a symbol of musical



established Stravinsky as the most remarkable composer of his decade. Within a year he had produced an even more remarkable

radicalism, with the power to stun and amaze even seventy years later. Any standard music history will tell you about the riot that occurred at

the *Rite* premiere, and this was only the most explosive event during a fifteen-year period of astonishingly fertile creativity in all the arts, a creativity that was strangled only by the advent of the Great War.

Thereafter, all the books say, Stravinsky's style underwent not one but a whole series of profound changes. What emerged was his commitment to something called neoclassicism, which dominated his art approximately from 1917 to 1952. In the public consciousness it did not matter that, as an aesthetic phenomenon, musical neoclassicism had had a vigorous existence for nearly a century, and can be traced back much further than that; nor did it matter that the most compelling aspect of the "neoclassical" works of Stravinsky was their highly eclectic and personal character. What mattered was that Stravinsky was consciously aping the stylistic mannerisms of his eighteenth- and nineteenth-century

continued on page 8

# MONETARISTS LOSE VELOCITY

Brian Kelley, A'85

As Tufts students lounge in the sun this summer, they will be apathetic about who will lead United States monetary policy for the next four years. But on August 5, 1983 current Federal Reserve chairman Paul A. Volcker's term comes to a close.

When he was appointed by Jimmy Carter in 1979, Volcker vowed to be the first Federal Reserve chairman to implement the Milton Friedman monetarist theory to U.S. money markets. The result was that inflation dropped from roughly 18% to 4% but only at the cost of record high interest rates and the worst recession since the Great Depression.

Under the monetarist theory which Volcker initiated, the Fed. targeted the money growth rate instead of interest rate to bring skyrocketing inflation under control. Slow, steady money growth, argued the monetarists, would ease "inflationary expectations" in the financial markets. Although interest rates would invariably rise initially, once investors were certain there would be no resurgence of inflation, they would not demand high interest rates to protect their investments. But as money growth fell from 8% in 1979 to 5% in 1981, interest rates refused to come down.

As interest rates stalled at their highest post-war level, the economy began to slide. According to the monetarist theory, a sharp increase in the growth of the money supply at this point should have produced an almost immediate increase in gross national product. Volcker first began to loosen the reins on money growth in June, 1981, but the economy approached near depression levels. Finally, in August, 1982, Volcker was forced to abandon the monetarist experiment

and revert to targeting interest rates. However, after eight months of money growth averaging 14%, the recovery is just beginning, and its strength is still in question.

The reason for the failure of the monetarist experiment was the collapse of a pseudo-predictable economic variable—the velocity of money. Velocity is the ratio of gross national product to M1 (the combination of currency and demand deposits), and it measures the rate at which money changes hands in the economy. Instead of continuously rising as it has for decades, velocity has been falling. The unpredictability of velocity has negated any confidence the Federal Reserve could have about the impact of any money growth rate on GNP. The recent decline in velocity has drained the Fed's attempts to stimulate the economy by increasing the money supply.

Monetarists have never argued that velocity is entirely predictable. They realize that in a weak economy the public's attitude about where to hold its assets varies widely. Monetarist theory says that lower interest rates reduce incentives to hold cash in savings accounts, money market funds, etc. (all of which are not included in M1), and therefore the public would hold more money in checking accounts which are included in M1. Furthermore, the fear of losing one's job in an economic climate with 10% unemployment is even stronger incentive to hold money in checking accounts where it is more accessible. Therefore, monetarists, thinking M1 was sure to increase somewhat, predicted a slight decline in velocity, but the total collapse of the variable, as has been occurring since April, 1981, was never expected.

To the dismay and anger of the monetarists, Paul Volcker realized last July that the continuing decline

in velocity had to be controlled. He abandoned the monetarist experiment by pumping up money growth by 10% thus driving down interest rates. However, interest rates are still too high, and it may now be too late for loose money policies to undo the damage the monetarist experiment has incurred.

It may be decades before velocity is stable enough for the Federal Reserve monetarist programs to the U.S. economy again. However, even if this round of monetarism is blamed for the worst post-war recession, it still is credited for cutting inflation to near disinflationary levels. It would be wise to realize that even this one boon accredited to monetarism is probably erroneous. Although vise-tight monetary controls did abate some inflationary pressures, nearly 20% of the recent decline in the

consumer price index (a measurement of inflation) is directly attributable to the decline in energy prices resulting from the feud within the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). Furthermore, deregulation of the trucking and airlines industries, initiated by President Ronald Reagan, has helped lower prices.

The lesson to be learned from the monetarist experiment (a lesson Paul Volcker must learn if he expects to be reappointed) is that the only way to maintain a recovery and keep prices from skyrocketing again is to increase productivity. Greater productivity, in turn, is only attainable through increased capital investment. The Federal Reserve must keep interest rates low, which it has not, if capital investment is to spur any lasting recovery in the near future.

## Letters

continued from page 2

different reasons. After seeing the other superpower close up, I would hope that people would realize two things: that the Russian people are no different than we are in their hopes and fears, and that the Soviet Union is a nation not much different than our own, except the fact that our political and economic systems work and theirs do not. Their one advantage is that their propaganda is much better than ours.

—Stephen B. Morriseau, A'83

In response to Douglas Shooker's April 1983 article on his travels to the Soviet Union, I have a few comments to add. As a recent traveler inside the Iron Curtain, I feel qualified to support many of his views. Economically, the Marxist-Lenin system fails to meet the needs of its people as is evident by the

widespread use of a "second" black market system. This system provides all the basic needs for the people, but at an extremely high price.

Politically, the Russian people are no better off. Controlled press, television, and radio present a very one-sided approach to every issue imaginable; therefore its citizens are ignorant to Western and Russian reality and will never be able to work to improve their government.

The presence of military oppressiveness is apparent on every Russian street. For those idealistic Americans who think the Soviets are willing to work for peace, I find that the Soviets are not peace-loving but are constantly ready for war. Perhaps we can learn from this repressive regime in terms of our own defensive posture.

The Russian people and other

continued on page 7

# GENERAL WESTMORELAND DISCUSSES THE

The Vietnam War has deeply affected the history and attitudes of all Americans. During the 1960s and early 1970s, college campuses stirred with controversy and protest as Americans the same age as we participated in a distant and often strange conflict.

Unfortunately, both during the War and after its close, the claims of those who opposed or misunderstood our intentions drowned out the real explanations for our initiative. All too infrequently did we hear — or were able to hear — the voices to describe our sincere goals in Vietnam.

This month marks the eighth anniversary of the fall of Saigon to the Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces. On April 20, 1983, The Primary Source's Editor Daniel Marcus had the unique opportunity to discuss the events and issues of the Vietnam War with William C. Westmoreland. General Westmoreland was Vietnam field commander for the United States from 1964 to 1968 and later Army Chief of Staff from 1968 to 1972. He was Time Magazine's "Man of the Year" for 1965.

The Primary Source has always strived to provide a voice for conservative viewpoints that are absent at Tufts. We hope this interview creates an impetus for our fellow students to learn more about the Vietnam War, not just from those who opposed our actions, but also finally from those who created and implemented our policy.



General Westmoreland in his favorite stance atop a jeep, talking to men of the 4th Infantry Division in March 1967. (Photograph from A Soldier Reports)

#### The Primary Source:

I would like to begin with an overview of the major events prior to and during the Vietnam War.

#### General Westmoreland:

I could make the case that the Vietnam War started in 1947.

#### The Primary Source:

With the Truman Doctrine? [The Truman Doctrine of 1947 stated that the United States would "support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures...."]

#### General Westmoreland:

The Truman Doctrine of 1947 was... a derivative of a readjustment in international relations of areas of influence throughout the world following the end of World War II. At that time, it did appear... that the Soviet Union would be very aggressive and take advantage of peace treaties that followed World War II and the defeat of the

Germans and Japanese. It would proceed to put political pressure and initiative subversive programs to extend its hegemony and take advantage of that period of international flux.

#### The Primary Source:

The Truman Doctrine was then implemented... in the Korean War. We believed we had to uphold and protect democracy in that region.

#### General Westmoreland:

Korea was outright aggression. We had no troops there but... rather a military mission.... We were advising South Korea militarily and assisting that government. Of course, we do not now have a peace treaty in Korea, only an armistice.

---

"I believe a serious mistake was made, not only by the President, but also by the leadership of Congress, in not asking for affirmation of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution each year."

---

#### The Primary Source:

Another important region was Indochina. Except this time, did we give the needed assistance? [Indochina is a political term for peninsular Southeast Asia between China and India. It is now divided into Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea.]

#### General Westmoreland:

With respect to Indochina, our interest in that region began during the fighting in Korea. After all, the French were fighting in Vietnam during the 1950s and the Dien Bien Phu defeat occurred in 1954. [Dien Bien Phu was a military outpost in North Vietnam. Following its seize, the French defenders surrendered to the Vietminh forces. Later that year, France formally withdrew from Indochina.] We gave aircraft and considerable moral and physical support to the French. But we were not involved in combat there.

#### The Primary Source:

I would now like to discuss the events of the War and first the Gulf of Tonkin incident that led to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. [The Resolution was proposed in August of 1964 by President Lyndon Johnson following unprovoked attacks by North Vietnamese vessels of U.S. destroyers in the Gulf.]

#### General Westmoreland:

The Gulf of Tonkin incident was one of the most important events of the War. I would say the Resolution was a benchmark since it gave the President virtually full authority. It was overwhelmingly approved by the Congress of the United States. Hence, President Johnson had the authority to commit whatever he deemed necessary to realize our objective in Southeast Asia. Our objective was to... block the obvious efforts of communist pressure to takeover South Vietnam. The Resolution basically gave President Johnson a carte blanche.

---

"The main purpose of the bombing was to demonstrate to the North Vietnamese leadership that we had the power to hurt them severely and thus encourage negotiations to bring the War to a close."

---

In the context of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, I would like to make an observation that I feel is important. I believe a serious mistake was made, not only by the President, but also by the leadership of the Congress in not asking for affirmation of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution each year. This was an error in my opinion because, over the years, the policies of the executive branch — which were dedicated to making good on our commitment — and that of the legislative branch, grew further and further apart. The legislative branch was influenced, as it should, by the attitudes of the electorate. If there had been

affirmation each year of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, a debate would have ensued not only in the Congress, but throughout our country. I would have had the effect of a national debate. A vote would have been taken in Congress, and the Resolution could have been rejected, modified or reaffirmed. That was not done and, as a result, the alienation of the executive branch and the legislative branch grew further and further apart and the country became seriously divided.

Why did the President not ask for affirmation each year or the Congressional leaders demand this? In my opinion, they were afraid of a national debate. And in some quarters, they were more afraid of the "hawks" than the "doves". They felt that if the "hawks" got the upper hand, they would push for more aggressive action which might be provocative. There was great concern in Washington... that Red China... would become involved. And that our leadership wanted to avoid at all cost.

#### The Primary Source:

Would you therefore say that the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was the first major mistake of the War?

#### General Westmoreland:

Well, I don't think the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was necessarily a mistake. It was a reaction to provocation by the North Vietnamese. The mistake was the way it was kept on the book without a challenge of affirmation, either asked for by the President, or demanded by Congressional leaders.

#### The Primary Source:

Moving on to another aspect of the War President Johnson believed... bombing would be a tool to stop the War and North Vietnamese infiltration. Bombing was also used as a tool to bring the North Vietnamese to the negotiating table. Do you think this was a successful tactic?

---

"Without the commitment of U.S. troops South Vietnam would have lost... by the end of 1965. Never did we lose sight of the need to train and equip the South Vietnamese to takeover eventually the full burden of the War."

---

#### General Westmoreland:

First of all, it was not a tactic, it was a strategy. And I would reverse your order. The main purpose of the bombing was to demonstrate to the North Vietnamese leadership that we had the power to hurt them severely and thus encourage negotiations to bring the War to a close. Few military men thought that the infiltration from North Vietnam would be stopped by bombing. But we have to recognize that bombing did significantly curtail the influx of North Vietnamese troops and political cadres to the South. We most importantly had to show the leadership in Hanoi that we had the power and the national will to succeed in Vietnam. President Johnson hoped that the communists would tacitly accept a divided Vietnam or come to the conference table.

#### The Primary Source:

One of the most controversial events of the War was the Tet Offensive. [The Tet Offensive was a coordinated cluster of attacks against cities and bases in South Vietnam beginning January 30, 1968.] It is now generally agreed that we won decisively the Tet Offensive. But why did you request an additional 206,000 American troops after we had won?

#### General Westmoreland:

I didn't request an additional 206,000 troops as suggested by your question. General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President asked me if I needed more troops — reinforcements which they said were available. I wanted to strengthen our northern forces near the Demilitarized Zone without taking a risk elsewhere. So I did ask for an Airborne Brigade and a Marine Regiment. General Wheeler then visited me in Saigon and explained the

# STRATEGIES AND GOALS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

weakness of our military forces to cope with exigencies elsewhere in the North. We discussed the opportunity presented by the defeat of the enemy at Tet: to follow up success and take the offensive — an opportunity to end the War on our terms. On the assumption that two things would take place — namely, a call-up of reserves to improve our over-all military posture and a political decision to pursue a more aggressive strategy — I gave General Wheeler a contingency troop list. It was not a request for large reinforcements per se. I made not a specific request for troop deployment, but rather what I thought we might need to mobilize and strike a weakened enemy and at last bring him to the conference table. The only way to end the fighting on terms favorable to us was to escalate the War.

Such a concept ran head on to a political desire to begin de-escalation. I did not submit any request to deploy 206,000 troops. But when *The New York Times* unwittingly reported this matter out of context, it further fueled the political debate.

*The Primary Source:*

Finally, I would like to discuss the events that brought about the Treaty of Paris. Do you think the Christmas bombings brought the Vietcong to

"[The use of propaganda by the North Vietnamese] may go down in history in the same category as the Trojan Horse."

sign the agreement? [From December 18, 1972 until December 30, 1972, President Nixon ordered bombing on North Vietnam.]

*General Westmoreland:*

There is no question that it did, but unfortunately it came four years too late. If we had put that amount of pressure on the Hanoi regime after the Tet Offensive in 1968, the leadership in Hanoi would have begged us to come to the conference table and we would have been in a position to negotiate from strength.

*The Primary Source:*

Do you think the final agreement we made with the North Vietnamese was a betrayal to the security and well-being of the South Vietnamese?

*General Westmoreland:*

The agreement was theoretically workable. But basic to the agreement was American assistance in providing the wherewithal to defend themselves. When Congress drastically reduced those essential supplies to the South Vietnamese, there was no way for them to survive the pressures from the North without the recommitment of American military power which was outlawed by the Case-Church Amendment to the fiscal year 1974 appropriations act.

*The Primary Source:*

Your consistent strategy throughout the conflict was to "Americanize" the War. Please describe this approach and your evaluation of its success.

*General Westmoreland:*

It was a strategy of necessity. Without the commitment of U.S. troops, South Vietnam would have been lost, in my opinion, by the end of 1965. Never did we lose sight of the need to train and equip the South Vietnamese to takeover eventually the full burden of the War.

*The Primary Source:*

During the Nixon administration, we supposedly began the process of "Vietnamization."

*General Westmoreland:*

I proposed such a concept to President Johnson in November of 1967. The Johnson administration did not buy it; they did not want to pay the price of giving the South Vietnamese the essential equipment. The concept was later adopted by the Nixon administration.

*The Primary Source:*

So you agree with Nixon's strategy of "Vietnamization"?

*General Westmoreland:*

I agreed with the idea of eventually turning the

War over to the South Vietnamese step-by-step; but I did not agree with the way the Nixon administration did it, which was an arbitrary pull-out of American troops based on political, not military, considerations. The South Vietnamese would not be able — alone — to hold back the communist enemy, and Hanoi was supported by [the People's Republic of] China and Russia. It really would have taken several more years for the South Vietnamese army to be trained and capable of providing security against aggressive North Vietnam in consideration of a hostile border of over 800 miles.

"Our leaders should continue to provide help to El Salvador, because another victory by Marxist forces would be a strategic setback for the United States and a terrible psychological blow to pro-American nations in that region."

*The Primary Source:*

What role did North Vietnam play in the Vietnam War? Its propaganda had a tremendous impact on the American perception of the War.

*General Westmoreland:*

Those of us who were dealing with the situation know as early as 1965 that the whole situation had been motivated and aggravated by the North. Propaganda came from Hanoi, from the Chinese, from the Soviet Union, and from Stockholm, which was Hanoi's propaganda base in the Western world. That propaganda overwhelmed the truth. The impression was given that this was a home-grown domestic revolution in the South. It said Hanoi had little or nothing to do with the insurgency and that North Vietnam had no troops in South Vietnam. It was all a deception. This activity may go down in history in the same category as the Trojan Horse.

*The Primary Source:*

With regard to the events and policy decisions of the Vietnam War, what were your preceptions and relationships with your superiors?

*General Westmoreland:*

Well, I'm not going to get into personalities. President Johnson was my Commander in Chief and I served him loyally. But I did not entirely agree with all his strategies and the way he dealt with the War at home....

McNamara looked at the Vietnam War in terms of the financial cost of the War. He was a business man and therefore had a business perspective. As an example, he wanted to end the War without having any surplus material left over as was the case in World War II.

"The major lesson of the Vietnam War is that our country cannot be successful in any conflict unless there is overwhelmingly public support for our efforts."

*The Primary Source:*

It has been eight years since the fall of Saigon. And today critics of American policy continue to parallel the Vietnam War with policies initiated today. The most important example is El Salvador. Do you have any comments on the war in El Salvador?

*General Westmoreland:*

El Salvador is strategically far more important than Vietnam for the United States.... El Salvador's problems we hope will be solved by the El Salvadorans themselves; but we should try to help to neutralize the Marxist guerrilla movement. The army of El Salvador needs military training and material help. If we give them too little help, we will find that El Salvador will go the way of the guerrillas who are supported by Nicaragua. Our leaders should continue to provide help to El Salvador, because another victory by Marxist forces would be a

strategic setback for the United States and a terrible psychological blow to pro-American nations in that region.

*The Primary Source:*

How do you feel about the anti-nuclear arms movements today? Many of these so-called "peace" movements could more appropriately be called appeasement movements.

*General Westmoreland:*

Well, everyone wants peace. The question is how to achieve it and sustain it. There are always people who forget that peace can be maintained only by a strong America. This is my firm belief.

*The Primary Source:*

Of all the issues that college students of history and political science have discussed, one of the most controversial topics is the important lessons of the Vietnam War. What do you perceive is the most important lesson of the War?

*General Westmoreland:*

The major lesson of the Vietnam War is that our country cannot be successful in any conflict unless there is overwhelming public support for our efforts.



General Westmoreland addressing a Joint Session of the U.S. Congress in November 1967. (Photograph from A Soldier Reports)

We would like to express our appreciation to General William C. Westmoreland for this informative and important interview.

Many thanks to Dean John Roche of the Fletcher School for his recommendations. Also, we are indebted to Professor Henry Delfiner for his continuous support and participation.

Why We Were In Vietnam by Norman Podhoretz (Simon & Schuster, New York, 1982) was a major source of information for this interview. To learn more about the Vietnam War and General Westmoreland, we highly recommend his book, A Soldier Reports (Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York, 1976, paperback by Dell).

We would like to indicate that, because of his pending lawsuit, General Westmoreland was unable to discuss the CBS-Television report, "The Uncounted Enemy: A Vietnam Deception."

# TO COLLEGE STUDENTS

## A MESSAGE FROM ROBERT WELCH

### Editor of *American Opinion Magazine*

This essay is intended for the decent, self-respecting, law-abiding, industrious, and idealistic young men and women on our campuses who still seek to learn the truth. In other words, for about ninety percent of the total student body of America's colleges.

We should like to tell you some things that are true which you will not learn in college; and some things which you may learn that simply are not true. As to *why* you are being subjected to so much falsehood on every side, that is a long story. We can only start you to wondering and seeking, so that in time you may find out for yourselves. And please do not be mad at us if we put some of our facts rather bluntly, or if they make you uncomfortable. For, to paraphrase Emerson, you can have either comfort or truth, but you can seldom have both together.

We submit below some of the falsehoods and stupidities with which many of you are being asked to fill your minds, and refutations that are demonstrably true on the basis of man's history and experience.

1. You are being told that the American economic and political system is a dismal failure. Actually, and despite all of its shortcomings below the ideal of perfection, it has produced by far the best environment for human life that the world has ever known. It is government intervention in the economy and the perversion of the American system that is proving to be a dismal failure.

2. That our "Western Civilization is not worth saving." This is spouted chiefly by sophomoric smart alecks, who do not have the slightest idea of what they are talking about, and by pro-Communist professors who have an axe to grind. Actually, you very students to whom we are writing have more privileges, more comforts, more freedom, and more pleasures available, than were dreamed of by the most powerful lords and ladies of earlier centuries. What you most lack, for the fullest enjoyment of your wonderful young lives, is an adequate sense of gratitude and of matching responsibility. Many of you are being kept so ignorant of the past, and so brainwashed about the present, that you may become willing to throw away the whole tremendous bequest from your ancestors without even understanding its value and its cost.

3. That license, rebellion, and anarchy are synonymous with freedom. You have not even been allowed to catch up with what the Greeks so wisely told us more than two thousand years ago: *Without law and order there can be no freedom* because without law and order even good men are completely restricted in their movements by the necessity of defending their homes, their families, and their lives from the predatory activities of evil men.

4. That "property rights" are far inferior to human rights. That is like saying that your arm is inferior to your body. So-called property rights are a very important part of human rights. It would be well to remember one thing which most of you may not even have been allowed to learn: *Private property is the cause of civilization, far more than its result.*

5. That "freedom and equality" are compatible. This deliberate fraud was planted in the modern mind by the power-seeking conspirators who brought on the French Revolution, as a means of fomenting mob action which they could manipulate to their advantage. The very battle cry is phony on its face. Freedom and equality together are utterly impossible for the simple reason that free men will never remain equal even for an hour, and much less for an age.

6. That it is the function of government to provide for its citizens. This is, of course, the road back to serfdom. Government should always be restricted to purely negative powers and responsibilities. It should protect good and productive men and women from the predatory and criminal actions of lazy and evil men. To whatever extent government goes beyond those functions it becomes an obstacle to all progress and a threat to all freedom.

7. That ethics are determined by the situation, and all morality is relative. This sophistry would lead — is intended to lead — to complete chaos on all human relationships. For who is to decide what immorality is justified in any particular situation? Why, the individual involved, of course, according to his own needs or desires. So an infinite number of value judgements then take the place of an accepted moral code. And the only defense needed for murder would be *de gustibus non est disputandum*. (Concerning tastes there is no basis for dispute.)

8. That age and experience count for nothing, and today's youth knows all the answers. In some quarters you are even led to believe that your elders should allow youth to take over all of their authority and responsibilities. But this never works out well in practice, for either young or old. There is still much wisdom in the proverbial lament: If youth only had the knowledge, or if age only had the strength! The world makes its greatest progress, and provides the best opportunity for human happiness, when there is at least a tacit partnership between the two, with both generations making their respective contributions to that opportunity.

9. That the family is an outdated institution. It may surprise you to learn how old is this "new" doctrine. The weakening of family ties, or even destruction of the traditional family concept altogether, has been a goal of governments seeking totalitarian power since at least the days of Sparta. In Soviet Russia today children have long been taught to be grateful to the state, rather than to their parents, for the food they eat, the room they sleep in, the clothes they wear, the education they receive, and any entertainment that is provided for them. For a totalitarian state simply cannot allow any loyalty by anybody to anything except itself. And there are those who desire to bring about these same conditions in America today. But actually the family, with its close ties and loyalties, always has been and always will be the most important structural unit of any worthwhile civilization.

10. That there can be security without a *corresponding* loss of freedom. Actually, total security can be found only in a prison.

We are recruiters for the truth. And Truth needs Youth at present, even more than it needs knowledge and experience.

For it is obvious today, even to the most casual observer, that the world is now full of cruelty and terror, of filth and bestiality, of suffering and despair. All of the crimes of history are being skillfully employed to bring about these conditions, for the sake of ever greater power on the part of those who run the show. But the whole tyranny depends on just the two foundations of *falsehood and cowardice*. All it would take to restore freedom and decency and happiness and hope to contemporary life is simply *truth and courage*. Both of these are what youth could readily supply.

Expose and remove the clever falsehoods from the indoctrination process, and the whole body of argument for collectivism would crumble into a pathetic ruin. Reveal the lies in the Communist propaganda, and it will immediately collapse. Have the courage to stand up unwaveringly for the truth, against all the pressures that have been created to maintain such massive deception, and soon others will join your efforts to demolish all the entrenched power of evil. These are the mighty projects of high endeavor for which the idealism and strength of youth are now so badly needed.

As your life now stretches away, seemingly so far and so expansively before you, we hope that these few words might inspire each of you to say quietly to yourself, but with infinite resolution:

I am not one of the lower animals. I am a man (or a woman). As one of the present "heirs of all the ages," I have all the wonderful accomplishments of mankind over thousands of years as my inheritance. I shall study that inheritance, sustain it, and enjoy it. I shall improve it for those who come after me. If I die in that attempt it will be because I have lived in it first. And in due course millions like me will wipe away the poisonous slime of deception, hatred, and cruelty from the face of our planet, and go on with good will, compassion, and common sense to make this a better world.

Tufts students who visit The American Opinion Bookstore, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, before June 30 will receive a free copy of the best-seller, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, by Gary Allen, and seniors, as an added commencement gift, will receive a copy of *Teddy Bare*. The American Opinion Bookstore is beside the U.S. Post Office, a short jog from the "Hill" and a comfortable walk.

This advertisement sponsored by Shirley Tufts Lane, J'46  
Andrew A. Lane, A'42

# ON THE RIGHT

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

Berlin, March 23 — Suppose that — don't laugh, please. We are being serious — you were the paid propaganda minister for East Germany and you were assigned the challenge of justifying the Wall. That's a little bit like receiving a memorandum from the Reichsführer, "Before you sign off tonight, do something to justify Auschwitz." But those types are grown in Communist countries, and here is the latest on Why There Is a Wall to keep people from the paradise over there from coming, as they did in such numbers up until August 13, 1961, over here.

This is how it goes. "You see, Communism is inexorable. We know this because Karl Marx and Lenin told us so. To be sure, there will be the occasional pullback, because history does not move like a glacier, rather in fits and starts, until the grand revolution overwhelms everything. Well, under the circumstances, you need an occasional prop to take care of the fits and starts — a wall, for instance, to impede temporary panics." The French use the expression *reculer pour mieux sauter*, back one step, forward two steps. See? "Moreover, the Wall is a great big gorgeous symbol of the invincibility of Communism. Just as

the Christians have their Cross, we have our Wall. The symbol of: Nothing will get past our nation to aid the revolution on earth."

You like? Whoever came up with that one belongs on Madison Avenue. Imagine the case he could make *against* the Wall.

It is, of course, an enduring humiliation to the Germans and to the Communists. The knowledge that without a wall supplemented with police dogs and machine guns and land mines you could not keep your people in their own homeland is a most awful rebuke to that homeland, particularly inasmuch as there is no reason why there need be differences between the standard of living, and the degree of freedom, given to West Germans and East Germans. Accordingly, the Wall is a scarlet letter.

But, and this must be weighed carefully, scarlet letters are more or less effective depending on the environmental position on adultery. It is true that West Germans nowadays do not sufficiently appreciate their freedom. And true that in East Germany nowadays not so many people as one might expect deplore in any politically active way their condition.

East Germany is different from

## What Does The Wall Separate?

the other satellites in many respects, not least that 80 per cent of the East German population regularly sees the West German population. There is simply no way of preventing this. For a while, 25 years ago, any antenna that was aimed suspiciously toward the West endangered that antenna's owner. But stopping Western television is on the order of stopping rock 'n' roll or marijuana. So the East Germans did the next best thing, which was to try to make their own television interesting, which, however, is on the order of telling the *Daily World* to be funny. What they watch is West German television.

But watching West German television reminds them, among other things, of Western difficulties, like crime and unemployment. The middle-aged East German has never experienced political freedom. And although the Wall constantly reminds us that East Germans would flow to West Berlin if they could do so, it is incorrect to suppose that all of them would do so. Leaving home is never easy. Home includes family and friends. And, in Communist Germany, security of the kind you get in Sing Sing, where there is no unemployment, and none of the contingent experiences that make

freedom not only enjoyable, but also adventurous.

The slavish Stalinism of East Germany is most easily accounted for by the vivid memory of their neighbors to the east, millions of whom died, a generation ago, in German concentration camps, or from German bullets. It is for this reason that anything smacking of nationalism stays out of the idiom of German politics — and here we speak not only of Communist Germany but of West Germany. German nationalism brings to mind: Hitler. And before him, the Kaiser. And before him, Bismarck. At Versailles Clemenceau remarked that he was so fond of Germany, he wished at least two of them. That extra-ideological insight explains, in part, the durability of the Wall.

In East Germany, after forty years of Communism following 15 years of Nazism, there are people who even though they know what life is like under freedom because they see it on their television screens every day, grow up inured to an oppressiveness they accept as one might accept freckles, or any other birthmark. We are reminded not only by East German complacency, but by West German insouciance, that reunification is many years down the road.

## POLITICAL INTOLERANCE AT TUFTS

continued from page 1

University" was simply not true.

What vote was ever taken as to whether *we* students authorized the illegal seizure of university property? This issue was ignored when the organizers met the press on Friday afternoon.

During the press conference, a group of students turned up to express the popular sentiment on this campus: regardless of the issue, the students did not support the "sit-in." In the name of democracy, the speaker invited all interested to voice their opinions. When one man jumped up to express his opposition to the rally, he was told he could not speak. He began to address the crowd, despite TPAC's "democratic censorship," at which time the microphones were turned off. After much outcry from the crowd, a vote was taken and the man was allowed to speak.

In the end, the "sit-in" caused President Mayer to promise to appoint a student-faculty committee to examine the tenure process. Student-faculty committees are but one of the many ways in which this university takes our interests as students into account. The demonstrators complained that they have no say in the running of this university, while in fact students' concerns are considered more often than at most comparable universities. One demonstrator noted that at Brandeis a student demonstration led to the reinstatement of a radical professor whose contract was not renewed.

The demonstrator pointed to this incident as proof that student "input" and "democracy" is taken into account at other universities. This, in fine Tufts tradition, is yet

another misnomer.

Intimidation should not be mistaken for constructive input. If President Mayer had granted tenure to Dreier because of the "sit-in," he would only encourage students to resort to violence in the future when they don't favor a university policy. The "sit-in" polarized opinions on campus. After the shameful display at Ballou, the Administrators might be more inclined to disregard student opinions on the presumption that we are not mature enough to make decisions.

What, in the end, did the "sit-in" accomplish? TPAC's biggest accomplishment was to turn campus opinion against the demonstrators. Although TPAC decried the Administration, it was the Administration — and not the students — that took the demonstrators seriously. While students were hanging banners out their dorm windows which read, "Give us back Ballou" and "We like Jean" (Mayer), the Tufts dining service was sending free food to the demonstrators. Despite receiving several complaints from students demanding access to Ballou Hall, the Tufts Police, instead of clearing the building, delivered pizzas to the demonstrators.

In the final analysis, the building was cleared on Friday night, April 29, not because the Administration finally decided to take action but because President Mayer was afraid that, according to one of the demonstrators, "drunken kids coming from frat parties" would attack the protesters at Ballou. In the end, the spoiled children who were demanding their own way were saved by an Administration cognizant of student animosity

towards the demonstrators.

In the real world, the TPAC members would have been arrested for trespassing. If Tufts were a high school, the children would have been suspended or expelled, and their parents would likely have punished them.

What I have learned in my four years at Tufts is that political controversy works differently here than in the rest of the world. If this were the real world, the *Tufts Observer* could not slander a popular professor and then become self-righteous when asked to take responsibility. Only at Tufts could the nephew of a member of a Latin-American junta member call me a "fascist" because I am exercising my right to express a minority position on this campus. Only at Tufts could I have received death threats because — in working through the democratic process — I was accused of being a "fascist." Only at Tufts are the "liberal, progressive and open-minded" people the ones threatening lives and attacking the property of those of us labelled "fascists." Only at Tufts are posters torn down because "no one is interested in what you have to say," as a student once told me when I caught him ripping down a notice I had just posted. Only at Tufts would 200 people attend a "sit-in" because it is fashionable, but less than 60 people would march for an issue which we all believe in: ending violence against women. Only at Tufts would there be a Professor Elias who would refuse to speak to a publication because it is not "liberal." What does being "liberal" mean on a campus where some professors actually tell their

students that the conservative viewpoint doesn't need to be presented in a class because "that's the only opinion you hear out there" (in the real world)?

It is a shame that a few racist, sexist and politically intolerant people try to impose their viewpoints — in the name of liberalism — on this campus. What I hope overrides the intolerant minority for Tufts is that the faculty is among the best in the nation and the administration is amongst the most responsive. Yet my biggest fear is that if the students and professors alike who sat in at Ballou had their "democratic input" into the tenure process, this university might well be filled with even greater intolerance and ignorance than was ever seen at the Ballou Hall "sit-in."

## Letters

continued from page 3

exploited nationalities within the USSR are really very much like us. However, many years of repressive reality have altered optimistic ideals and instead have created widespread cynicism, apathy and corruption.

We as democratic citizens of the world have disappointed our brothers in the Soviet Union and now we run the risk of losing the last hold of democratic ideals in Central and South America.

My message is this: We must maintain our position as a democratic watchdog throughout the world at whatever cost. We must prevent Soviet and Soviet-style domination anywhere we can.

—Paul M. Clarke, A'84

# WHY EL SALVADOR NEEDS U.S. AID

MAY, 1983

continued from page 1

corporal, maintaining no telephone communications with the national headquarters and, at times, no radio contact with their regional commander. This degree of isolation leads to a lack of control over rural outposts, allowing indecent commanders to abuse their power. Furthermore, when guerrillas seize a town, army units must travel from their urban garrisons to the town, frequently being ambushed along the way. Once the army forces the guerrillas to retreat, it returns to its garrisons, leaving the town vulnerable to another attack. The seizure of towns such as Berlin by the guerrillas demonstrates less their military power, for they always remain incapable of occupying the towns for any noticeable length of time than the army's weakness of tactics in fighting the war.

The violations of human rights in El Salvador incur ardent criticism from many in the United States. Though such abuses still abound, and major problems remain to be solved, if one considers the long history of tyranny in El Salvador, the advances made in the past three and a half years are impressive. The number of civilian deaths attributable to political violence has fallen from 800 a month in October 1979 to about 150 a month. The land redistribution program has been extended now for the third time over the right-wing's opposition. Thus far, 20% of all arable land has been redistributed to tillers, and more is scheduled to follow.

Some argue that a reduction of U.S. aid, particularly military aid, would be the wisest course for

American foreign policy. Though such contentions reflect the desire to stabilize the situation in El Salvador, a reduction in U.S. aid would have the opposite effect. Such a policy would not only allow

Finally, the United States could use the military aid to pressure the Salvadoran army into adopting more effective anti-guerrilla tactics.

The stability enhanced by military aid reinforces the



increased guerrilla activity, but would also permit right-wing extremists to become more violent. When the United States refused to sell arms to Guatemala in 1977, the army felt free to begin its massacres of Indians. Similarly, if the Salvadoran government would have nothing to lose by pursuing a repressive policy, it might be inclined to do so. Taking away aid removes the leverage necessary for the United States to restrain right-wing extremists. Furthermore, U.S. military aid goes to train Salvadoran soldiers, teaching them restraint, discipline and respect for civilians. Military aid provides communications equipment to insure that rural commanders follow their orders.

effectiveness of economic aid. Since the guerrillas are attempting to cripple the economy, it would make more sense to prevent their acts of sabotage than to use all U.S. aid to rebuild that which was damaged. Instability and violence diminish the prospects for economic recovery. The proportion of beneficiaries of the land redistribution program remains dramatically lower in areas of high guerrilla activity than in other areas. Unless peace can be brought to El Salvador, economic improvement and social reform will never be fully attained.

Many have called upon the government of El Salvador to negotiate with the guerrillas to

achieve a political solution to the conflict. Negotiations will prove useful, but only if they will be aimed at supporting the democratization of the country. A dialogue might be useful if the government can convince some of the leftist faction to engage in peaceful opposition to the government. The talks should not, however, include proposals for power-sharing. Only non-radicals who agree to participate in the democratic process should be allowed into the government. The others would merely use a power-sharing negotiated settlement as a step towards seizing total control over the government. Radicals do not share power. The world has seen enough revolutions to give witness to this fact.

The current government of El Salvador was democratically elected by its people. The legitimacy of the election was confirmed by the more than 200 observers from over 40 countries as well as by the more than 700 journalists who served as de facto observers. The guerrillas, on the other hand, boycotted the elections because they knew that they enjoyed very little public support. The people have endorsed the reform program and the war against the guerrillas.

The United States should not impose an unwanted solution upon the Salvadoran people and give legitimacy to extremists who intend to shoot their way to power. The United States should continue its support of the Salvadoran government in carrying out the program of democratization and social reform mandated by its people.

## MUSICAL CONSERVATISM IN THE 20TH CENTURY

continued from page 3

predecessors, from Bach (Octet for wind instruments; Piano Concerto; Piano Sonata) to Mendelssohn (Capriccio) or even further back to Guillaume de Machaut (Mass), when he was not actually stealing from them (Pergolesi in *Pulcinella*, Tchaikovsky in *The Fairy's Kiss*). The neoclassical works became just as controversial as the earlier "radical" ballets, and remain so today, for different reasons. The public that still scorns *The Rite of Spring* may admire the *Symphony of Psalms* precisely because the latter, with all of its baroque counterpoint, is a less "modern" work; with others, the priorities are exactly reversed.

There is another composer whose significance in our century's music is possibly even more far-reaching than Stravinsky's, though less widely appreciated. Arnold Schoenberg, eight years older than Stravinsky, never had even remotely the same kind of success in his lifetime. Yet Schoenberg's role in the history of music is quite comparable to, and as substantial as, that of Einstein in physics. Schoenberg destroyed the tonal system of scales and triadic harmony that had been developed during the previous four centuries, and constructed an entirely new chromatic system of awesome intellectual power. He then

proceeded to embody this system over a thirty-year period in a series of works that are understood today even by relatively few professionals, and that have achieved almost no public appreciation; yet these works continue to fascinate virtually every composer alive today. Schoenberg's impact on the wider public still derives entirely from his earliest tonal works, such as the immense cantata *Gurrelieder* (1901), which shows that at the age of 26 Schoenberg had already achieved a technical mastery far beyond any of his older contemporaries. Small wonder, then, that he would outgrow tonality in his later works. Yet at all times in his very fertile career Schoenberg felt himself to be an ordinary foot-soldier in the Austro-German musical line, a logical continuator of a learned tradition whose pillars were Bach, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, Schubert, Schumann, Wagner, Bruckner, Brahms, and Mahler (the last two, and Mozart, he revered above all others). Although well aware of his own radical departures from his artistic ancestry, he steadfastly proclaimed his allegiance to it in his abundant writings as well as his works. The justice of this claim is mirrored in the title of a recent biography, *Arnold Schoenberg: The Conservative Revolutionary*.

Stravinsky and Schoenberg knew

each other personally between 1912 and 1913, and recognized the importance of each other's works while not understanding them very well. In later years they became philosophically opposed, exchanging petty polemics about each other's aesthetics. Yet after Schoenberg's death in 1951, Stravinsky took up his cause, materially assisting performances of Schoenberg's works which he had come, late in life, to understand. When Stravinsky wrote his own last works (1957-66), his musical language embraced Schoenberg's atonal technique wholeheartedly in a completely Stravinskian way.

It is ironic that these two great composers, hailed or reviled for decades as uncompromising radicals bent on destroying the art of music, thought of themselves — but not each other — as conservative. In the light of what they did achieve, however, it is hardly surprising that musical "radicalism" in the past thirty years has seemed quite tame. We now have composers of electronic music (Babbitt, Davidovsky, Berio), computer music (Dodge, Rogers, Chowning), aleatory music (Cage, Childs, Ashley), theater music (Subotnick, Martirano, Oliveros), process music (Reich, Riley, Glass), musical happenings (Young, Ono, Paik), third stream music (Schuller, Blake), totally organized music

(Boulez, Stockhausen), political music (Nono, Rzewski), and goulash music (Rochberg), to name just a few of the various trends or techniques that have been called "radical." There is also a vast variety of conservatives flourishing today, including American elder statesmen like Aaron Copland and Roger Sessions, both in their eighties, both influenced by Stravinsky and Schoenberg, both of them called radicals fifty years ago.

It is just as certain that there are no radicals in music any more, nor are there likely to be. Some may remember twenty years ago when Nam June Paik sawed the piano in half, and more recently you may have seen on the national news a *Sonata for piano and dogs*, a Juilliard piece which sounded rather like interrupted Prokofiev (I can't remember the composer's name). It has been a long time since anything-goes, and as things go, they went. What seems likely is that fewer and fewer fads will even come and go. There won't be any important trends in music, at least none that we have not seen already. If we are lucky, there may be a few great individuals, or more likely a few great works, works which will not so much be harbingers of future art as they will be highly personal transformations of the past. And it could be argued that, at least during the last four or five centuries, this has always been so.