

the CIA, or by the FBI, or by the KGB. It's a demonstration of the fundamental independence of American thought."

Although slightly inaccurate (IPS thought bears a strong resemblance to socialist thought the world over, and as such shows conformity rather than independence), Warnke's comments are in an important sense correct. Mark and Dick and IPS do not think what they think and do what they do because they are acting on anyone's instructions. They are not "card-carrying" anything and they do not secretly attend meetings with Soviet agents. If anything, the direc-

tion of influence has been the very reverse. The rhetoric and vocabulary of Arbatov's book much more closely resembles that of the *New York Times* editorial page, the Haynes Johnson column, and the IPS study than that of Lenin. Arbatov is *learning* from the American Left, not teaching them. No doubt that is why Haynes Johnson, whose columns always repay study, quoted Arbatov at some length recently and duly noted his "disturbing eloquence."

"The Soviets consciously borrow from the United States—technology, managerial know-how, *style* [my emphasis]," Barnet wrote in *The Giants*.

"But Americans, even those who would like to see fundamental change in the system, have little interest in the Soviet model." I think we must agree with Barnet about this.

Conservatives must abandon their conspiratorial explanations of leftist patterns of behavior and thought. Denial of the conspiracies (which once existed but no longer do), exposes to ridicule the suggestion that there are patterns (which do exist). An explanation based on instinct can be far more effective, and the Left itself sometimes invokes it. When rightists suggest that Soviet-armed, Cuban-supplied guerrillas in

El Salvador or elsewhere demonstrate a world-wide conspiracy, the Left has an interesting response—again containing an element of truth. The rebellion, they say, is *indigenous*, implying that deep in the human heart there is this natural, instinctive desire for socialism which (if not repressed by capitalists *et al*), will somehow find expression.

Okay, I'll buy that. El Salvador's rebels are indigenous, the socialist aspirations of IPS are indigenous, Dick Barnet and Marcus Raskin are indigenous. And so IPS is an indigenous research organization, not controlled by the KGB. □

EDITORIAL



GIVE PEACE A CHANCE

by R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr.

Perhaps I am just another "woolly-headed" liberal, dreaming of a better world mellow under sway of the golden rule; but I believe that it is time for the antagonists in Central America to sit down at the conference table and compose their disagreements in a humane manner so that they might get on with the real business of government, which is to say: bringing progress and reform to the people.

I am not alone. There is growing talk in liberal circles of the benefits of a "many-sided dialogue" on Central America featuring not only the region's indigenous nations but also the Reagan Administration, Cuba, and the USSR. A report signed by such no-nonsense types as ex-Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, and Mayor Henry Cisneros of San Antonio, Texas, called for just such a confabulation last month. I endorse it.

Let us have "political solutions" in Central America rather than the continued violence. Trying for "military solutions" is a futile business. Did a "military solution" ever work in Vietnam? Let the embattled Central American governments bring their opposition into "popular front" governments so that we can get on with

raising health standards, the Gross National Product, consciousness!

Economic backwardness in this region is appalling. So are health conditions. The women's movement is widely snickered at, and nowhere can you find a champion of gay rights who still has his front teeth intact. Improving the quality of life here is going to be a big job, and it cannot be undertaken until there is political harmony.

Now the first place I should like to

suggest a political solution is in Nicaragua. The *Wall Street Journal* made the suggestion in March, and it is surprising that my fellow liberals have remained mum. In a series of vivid reports the *Washington Post* has verified the existence of a well-organized rebel force actively opposing the Sandinista government. Further, we know that there are other disenchanted elements in the country. Nicaragua's is not a very democratic government. It is isolated from the people, and has brought in outside military advisers from Cuba

and the Soviet Union. Its problems could become worse.

The Sandinista government has been accused of numerous abuses against human rights, of failing to hold elections, and of petty acts of corruption. Thousands of Miskito Indians have been uprooted, and their villages have been destroyed. Many peasants who held rosy expectations for land reform are now bitter that the government forces them to give up their crops. The Catholic Church has been harassed, and this year it was barred from broadcasting uncensored Easter week services over its own station.

Obviously the Sandinistas are going to find themselves increasingly alienated from their own people. The bloodshed could get even worse. It is exigent that the junta sit down with all elements of the opposition and form a truly representative government. Will the Sandinistas do it? My guess is no, not without pressure from "world opinion."

Well, then, why have we not heard from the voices of world opinion? Human rights are obviously in dreadful condition in Nicaragua. Insurgents are all over the place. Why no outcry similar to the gathering outcry for a "political solution" in El Salvador? Is it because the Reagan Administration is on the side of the government in El Salvador and of the rebels in Nicaragua? →



Adapted from *RET's* weekly *Washington Post* column syndicated by *King Features*.

During the glory days of the Carter Administration I believe it was Ambassador Andrew Young who used to urge the United States to get on the side of revolution. If the reports in the media are to be believed, America is now firmly on the side of revolution in Nicaragua. Why are my fellow liberals not enthusiastic? Do they actually endorse the Sandinistas' oppression of the Miskito Indians and the Catholic Church? Do they agree with the Nicaraguan government's refusal to hold elections?

I agree with Cy Vance. Let us get on with "a many-sided dialogue" in Central America, but I wish he and his fellow liberals would be bolder by calling for a "coalition government" in Nicaragua. Sometimes it is very confusing to be a liberal. □

COMMENCEMENT RITES

Spring is here, and that means that on college campuses there will be beer guzzling and lewd doings on the lawns of fraternity and sorority houses. There will also be demonstrators, suppressing commencement speakers and maybe even bringing violence upon them. Actually the suppression of campus speakers has been on the rise for some time, but college officials fear it will increase with the balmy spring breezes.

Now, which species of campus high-jinks do you suppose will be put down more firmly by university

administrators, the bawdiness and boozing or the harassment of speakers? Let me tell you: indignant administrators will call in the cops with alacrity and a clear conscience when the jolly times turn overly bibulous, and it will be a stern and a magisterial university vice president who addresses the hung-over coeds and college boys the day after. Yet when a minority of idealists driven by goof-ball enthusiasms shouts down a distinguished speaker or heaves debris at him, a surprising number of university administrators will find the problem very delicate indeed.

Just what kind of speakers are being driven from the podiums? Are they homosexuals, advocates of weird cults, or atheistic Communists? All such folk speak on campus regularly. Is a campaign being orchestrated by the New Right or that other dreadful menace to our freedoms, the Moral Majority? Imagine the furor if it were. The *New York Times's* editorial pages would be inked in purple, tears would be shed on the evening news. Every good liberal would be in his prayer chamber, and at Yale, President A. Bartlett Giamatti would be launching still more alarums against the rising intolerance of the sinister Christian Right.

Of course the speakers being harassed are not all that controversial, at least not to the mainstream Americans whose tax dollars keep many of our institutions of higher learning open. Rather the speakers are usually representatives of our government or other eminent citizens

with perfectly democratic views. Why is it so difficult to maintain order when they arrive on campus? For that matter, why is their presence on campus so inflammatory? Some would create less of a stir on foreign campuses, and all would be safer speaking on any campus in the Soviet Union.

The answer is that American universities are increasingly provinces of bitterness, extremism, and anti-democratic values. Though the vast majority of university professors and administrators are well-intentioned people of carefully elaborated liberality, they are just disinclined to scotch their radicals even when the radicals act like storm troopers. Moreover there is that other little bug in their systems. It is hard for them to accept conservatives as having the same moral heft as liberals, not to mention those legendary species of American dissenter, for instance the Marxist, the anarchist, the militant. These conventional liberals expect conservatives to run small businesses and dutifully pay taxes. Those are the "good conservatives." When such conservatives express political views they cause consternation, and when they express those views forcefully they transform themselves into "arch" conservatives and very dubious characters.

A frequent victim of campus idealists has been our chief delegate to the United Nations, Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, one of the more

accomplished women to step off a college campus—she was professor at Georgetown for a decade—and into public life. Why should Jeane Kirkpatrick be so controversial at such liberal bastions as the University of California at Berkeley, where on February 15 she was forced from a lecture platform and made to cancel an address scheduled for the next day, while campus administrators hunkered under their desks? Has she been creating turmoil and angst at the United Nations? No, strangely enough while she has been there the United Nations has been comparatively quiescent—in fact more so than when the fabulous Andy Young was our ambassador, and he was reputed to be the most honeyed diplomat ever sent to soothe the Third World. Kirkpatrick is being hounded for administration policy in Central America. Like their heroes in the Sandinista government and the Salvadoran revolution our campus radicals flee from normal democratic channels, abuse the majority, and turn to violence.

Can nothing be done so that the majority of students might be free to hear the likes of Jeane Kirkpatrick? Last March organizations representing the nation's college presidents and faculty members issued a plea for tolerance. They could do more. I suggest they lighten their patrols along fraternity row and station a few cops in their lecture halls. Such a plan was followed at the University of Kansas recently. Four pests were arrested and freedom reigned. □

S P E C I A L C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

A Letter from Admiral Stockdale

Dear Mr. Tyrrell,

Thank you for your letter of January 19, and your agreeable comments about my appearance with Diane Sawyer on CBS morning news on January 13. She was a peach, and it was a pleasure to be led in such a relaxed manner through a brief discussion of my experiences as a prisoner of war in Hanoi, and to chat with her about the academic course I'm teaching at Stanford.

But did you catch that same show at the same time exactly two weeks later? Diane Sawyer was not part of that 7:45 segment on January 27; rather for about five minutes the screen was filled with old Vietnam war scenes narrated off camera by Bill McLaughlin. He reminded view-

ers that January 27 was the tenth anniversary of the signing of the Vietnam Peace Accords:

"... and then (on December 18, 1972) came the Christmas bombing of civilian targets... which had nothing to do with ending the war... The number of civilian casualties has yet to be released."

There are enough falsehoods in that paragraph alone to justify a demand for equal time. Those eleven days of bombing at the end of 1972 are a subject I could discuss on CBS morning news with *real* credentials. I was an eyewitness. And the truth is that not one bomb was dropped on Christmas; civilian targets were never deliberately hit (and far fewer were accidentally hit than in any bombing of a large industrial com-

plex since the invention of the airplane); the raids broke the will of the North Vietnamese as did nothing else in that war; and the number of total casualties (some lesser part of which were undoubtedly civilians) was publicly released by the North Vietnamese government and printed in the *New York Times* within a week after the last bomb was dropped on December 29. The casualty number was extremely low—1,318 killed—no more than a scant percentage of the casualty numbers common for European and Japanese cities bombed with comparable tonnage during World War II. Moreover, North Vietnam persisted, and still persists, in the validity of their figures. These facts have been in the public domain for years, yet they

have been ignored again and again and again. So let me make a few points you won't normally hear on CBS.

If I learned nothing else during eight years in wartime Hanoi, it was that Clausewitz is as right today as he was during the Napoleonic Wars; the name of the game in war is to break the enemy's will.

Now airpower's greatest utility is its shock effect, its ability to create fear and panic, particularly among the uninitiated and undisciplined. By the time our tactical raids crept up to Hanoi in 1966, every civilian in the city had undergone months and months of instruction in civil defense. "The scenario goes like this," the party-cadre's man might well have explained to the people on his block: