

"campus disruptions by militant students are a threat to academic freedom." And do you remember how many of these learned men had rejected the proposition that "student demonstrations have no place on campus"?

2). Fifty-four per cent disapproved either "with reservations" or "unreservedly" "the emergence of radical student activism in recent years." And do you remember the seventy-four per cent of them who had asserted that professors should be free to "advocate violent resistance"?

Clearly the American professor is idyllically ignorant of "cause and effect." He is a professional man without professional standards, but that doesn't make him a bad person. That merely means our next educational subsidy should reward professors for not teaching. □

Mr. Tyrrell is the light-heavyweight champion of St. Thomas College, St. Paul, Minnesota.

"Love" in the Streets

Revolution and the Secular Ethic of Love

Gary North

Revolution: the word is everywhere. On the surface, it would seem that Marx's dream of a revolutionary age is being fulfilled, although the various revolutions which we are presently facing are not all strictly Marxist in content and structure. This fact would not have discouraged Marx--the Paris Commune of 1871 was hardly a Marxist affair and Marx welcomed it in his Civil War in France. In the United States, the base of "revolutionary" operations centers in the university, the urban ghetto, and the hippie subculture. In these areas any number of "operators" are trying to control or direct the irrational urge for destruction: old-line Communists and innumerable "splinter" factions; Black Nationalists of various description; non-Marxist revolutionary humanists; and fragmented "New Left," which draws from all these groups. Such ingredients make the chaos total.

The race question and the problems of the Negro ghetto are important issues, but I am not so concerned with them at this point. The black revolutionaries are not motivated by the contemporary love ethic, nor do they claim to be. "Get Whitey!" seems straightforward enough. They act more openly and consistently within the revolutionary tradition, and as a result they are not so difficult to understand. Certainly they are easier to understand than the masochistic whites advocating perpetual tolerance and apparently unaware of or unconcerned with the destructive forces tearing down their own society. A more baffling problem for most

Americans is the question of revolution on the campus. Parents and taxpayers are asking themselves a basic question: Why should college students turn against the very society which makes possible their education through its taxes and gifts to educational institutions?

Let us remember that the vast majority of college students are not revolutionary. But this is a cause for rejoicing only in part; students are not conservative out of principle, but out of apathy. Since revolutionary activity does involve some degree of risk and personal commitment, most students are not revolutionaries. But enough of them are, for it does not take many dedicated anarchists to bring a highly interdependent and specialized institution, e.g. a university, to a grinding halt.

The usual answer to the question of why students revolt makes reference to "youthful idealism." Students supposedly have a higher standard of morality than do their elders. They have not compromised with the Establishment out of fear; they are not cowards; they are not submissive to evil vested interests. Anyway, this is how the argument tends to run. Yet the public is simultaneously expected to accept this fact along with another: that of the "new morality." The ethos of the new morality leads those same students to abandon the old patterns of courtship and romance. A new kind of freedom has been substituted--a freedom supposedly involving whole new vistas of human responsibility and concern. In fact, the new morality is just the old sin, and parents should not be deluded. Unfortunately most are deluded, or at least confused enough to remain silent. They seem to accept both the idea of youthful idealism and the idea of youthful promiscuity. In short, adults tolerate or even encourage these students' provocative actions because they have swallowed the line that these students are exponents of both a higher morality and a non-morality. The link supposedly bridging the gap is "love." The heart of the new situational ethics is the idea that "love conquers all," especially all moral standards and restraints. The slogan is "make love, not war," unless, of course, the war happens to be domestic. Even the domestic war is based on their idea of love (a less obvious fact which I hope to explain in this article.)

Under these circumstances, idealism is cheap. It is an idealism financed by unsuspecting, blinded and careless parents,



in cooperation with deceived and coerced taxpayers; often, they are the same people. Thus--insulated by a number of obliging institutional buffers--it is easy to criticize the prevailing scheme of things. And make no mistake about it, these are buffers: parents captivated by the concept of higher education and unconcerned by the content of that education; frightened college administrators compromised by revolutionary faculty members, their own relativism, a desire to appear "liberal" and a frantic unwillingness to admit to legislatures or alumni that anything is fundamentally wrong. The result was inevitable, and it should have been foreseen: a generation raised on permissive educational philosophies is now rebelling against the "bourgeois morality" which has nurtured both the students and the philosophies. The youthful enrages are taking the implications of their parents' moral flabbiness and permissiveness to their ultimate conclusion: total lawlessness. Both parents and college administrators (with a few exceptions) now stand back in horror, confused and helpless in the face of the product their ideas have wrought.

What we are witnessing is the triumph of relativism. For several centuries, relativism has been eating away at the foundations of western culture. Christian concepts of morality have sustained our civilization for many years, but now there is very little moral capital left to sustain the sons and daughters of the Enlightenment. Within the academic community--if we can still call it a community--relativism has become the intellectual creed which governs all endeavors. The schools are committed to a broad, supposedly neutral search for truth, but the search, not the truth, is foremost in professors' minds. Any faculty member who audaciously enters a classroom announcing that he has discovered some permanent truth will be regarded as utterly unprofessional and dogmatic. Students learn this very quickly, through a whole series of institutional controls. Karl Mannheim set the tone for all academic investigation in the social sciences back in the thirties, when his *Ideology and Utopia* raised total relativism to the status of a productive blessing in disguise.

In any culture where relativism is the dominant philosophy, culture's will to maintain itself must evanesce. As a result, the culture is left to the mercy of nihilists, who adopt one of relativism's key ideas--that no concept and no institution has any validity apart from the fleeting present--and conclude that no institution has any right to exist. To be at the mercy of the nihilists is to be abandoned. Relativism posits a world in which whirl is king; it can do little to arm itself against a religion of revolution. Revolution is simply relativism made explicit and consistent.

The hippie subculture is not directly linked to the campus, except insofar as members of both groups rely on the same drug pusher or the same pornographer for their supplies. A true hippie has dropped out of the establishment world, and this means the university. In any case, he will find it difficult to maintain a C average at a Berkeley or a Columbia if he lives

consistently with a philosophy of total departure. He has to leave. Nevertheless, there are some definite similarities between the hippie movement and the more radical students, and the source of that agreement is seen in their attitudes toward standards of any kind, especially moral standards. The student may have given more thought to the intellectual justification of his moral relativism, but the hippies' "love ethic" is fundamentally the same as his. The secular love ethic proclaims the unity of all life, and above all, the unity of humanity. There must be no obstacles to the full personal interaction among men and women; the sanctity of interpersonal relations is foremost. This implies that traditional moral standards must be abolished, since they act as inhibitions to the unity of mankind. Institutions that might promote such standards must also be abolished. Privacy becomes a barrier to the "full development of the individual." These nihilists have no understanding of the fabric of civilization; they cannot grasp the fact that humans need certain social and personal barriers in order to exist. They have read too much Georges Sorel and not enough Georg Simmel. They are determined, most of all, to destroy those most fundamental principles that divide men, religious principles. Love must conquer all.

Bearing this in mind, the reader may now have greater insight into the increasing militancy of the hippie movement. It is at this point that the hippie subculture is undergoing its own revolution. The basically pacifistic framework of the earlier "drop-outs" is rapidly passing. It is being replaced by a more strident activism. The Chicago riots brought this into the open. We are becoming accustomed to campus riots and ghetto riots, and the time of the rioting hippie is about at hand. The love ethic is not passive in nature; it can be converted into the most rigorous kind of revolutionary action. Though it may not seem immediately evident, the love ethic is not far removed in principle from the activism of the fascist movement or the Soviet and Chinese brands of revolutionary ferment. The hippies and the fascists have been monistic in orientation, i.e., willing to accept all things in principle (except opposition). The marxists are dualists who see all progress as a clash of irreconcilable opposites--a clash which will some day destroy the capitalist world and create a harmonious, peaceful, creative monistic world of proletarian happiness. Both philosophies take their stands against traditional and especially Christian societies that are founded on the idea of differences among men, but which seek to make possible certain kinds of voluntary cooperation in those spheres of life common to all members of the society. Such institutions and societies are written off by both the radical monists and the radical dualists: these establishment structures--to quote Trotsky--are fit only for the "garbage pile of history." The hippies, in what Robert Nisbet has called their quest for community, are likely candidates for seduction by some charismatic, totalitarian figure who will lead them in their struggle

against "straight" society. Here Charles Manson comes to mind.

In short, both relativism and the secular love ethic can lead (and are presently leading) to moral and political nihilism. As the nihilistic tendencies in the campus and hippie communities grow more pronounced, the means are increasingly available for establishing a common cause in revolutionary activity. This is the fusion which the various revolutionary minorities want to weld. At present, it would appear that the New Leftists stand on the brink of success, though their movement is incredibly fragmented. The lust for change overarches the fragments, magnetizing them together. In the absence of some establishment institution to oppose, I suspect they would turn into political cannibals--as did the Jacobins in 1793--but until that time, they can work within a common bond of chaos and revolutionary activity. Perhaps this has already taken place.

Berkeley has been the symbol of the "movement," and it is no accident that the little city of Berkeley houses both the University of California and the hippie subculture of Telegraph Hill. In recent months, the former hippie haven, Haight-Ashbury, has been depleted, as the migration to Berkeley has become pronounced. The open revolution broke out in Berkeley in 1964 during the Free Speech movement. Ironically in the year 1968--the University's centennial--the age of Mario Savio had just dawned. How proud Clark Kerr must have been! The

Berkeley-Oakland complex manifests the fusion of the real "triple revolution"--the ghetto, the university, and the hippie subculture. So if anyone should happen to ask you for a one-sentence summary of what took place on the outstanding campus of the largest, richest, and finest state-supported university in America, just tell him this: it is a century of secular, liberal relativism coming home to roost.

And the outcome of the Berkeley unrest? A precedent-setting defeat of a quarter of a billion dollar bond measure--which we can perhaps view as a positive good, for perhaps it indicated that the public is finally taking a critical interest in its university. If the administrators fear the loss of their budgets more than they fear the irresponsible students and faculty, there will be less "love" on the campus. In any case, students should not be too disheartened. Only one major institutional change has been made either at Columbia or Berkeley since the outbreak of violence: teaching loads have been dropped again! Now professors have to spend even less time with their alienated students. Perhaps the students will learn a lesson Edmund Burke offered us in 1790: revolutions seldom accomplish their ends, but they do make the earlier evils worse. □

Gary North is a Ph.D. candidate at the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Cover Story

In Praise of Youthful Idealism

R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.

I write from a profound sense of mental and physical exhaustion, for I have just read every jot, tittle and splutter uttered by Spiro T. Agnew since the plain folk of this great republic anointed him Vice President of these United States. Ah, but this was a mere warm-up. For having surmounted all the hazardous peaks of Mr. Agnew's speeches and tippytoed round his every volcanic interview, I--in a moment of youthful brashness--ventured on to the Himalayas as it were, to the vast mountains of criticism that have risen about this most controversial statesman. Yes, I actually labored over everything recently said by the Vice President, only to lumber on to everything the media have said about him--that is, everything their lawyers would allow them to print or mutter. And now, having regained consciousness and received the assurance of my family physician that I again have complete command of my faculties, I may cogitate over this arduous but somehow wonderful adventure.

It started with one of those crises which fate inevitably fires into every great man's life; as with Saint Paul, mine was a moment of revelation from which I would never be quite the same old rascal. Like the rest of the members of my glorious generation I was under immense stress. I

feared for my nation. Repression was upon us. Portentous shadows shrouded the land, precursors to the imminent resurrection of A. Mitchell Palmer, William Jennings Bryan and the fabled Senator Joseph McCarthy, all in one puff. Glimpses at the New York Times suggested that the Know-Nothing Party was again a going concern with powerful connections deep within the White House. For a certitude the Klan was about. It was only a matter of time before the Bolsheviki of Harvard would be in chains. Somber television commentators were reporting the nightly prowlings of the feared Agnew. Mercilessly he would strike the most defenseless of American institutions, uncoiling a venomous tongue and hatefully lashing the last relics of purity in the land: first the powerless television networks, then poor Mrs. Katharine Graham and her little gazette. Not even the New York Times was beyond his vengeance. Indeed this Agnew was bad stuff.

It was in this storm celler of depression--with the First Amendment gone, the Bill of Rights aflame--that I decided to investigate this Agnew for myself. I wrote the American Ministry of Information for a chrestomathy of his latest speeches, half expecting a Little Red Book. Ah, how wrong I was. The package