keeping or peace-observation operations generally and on Canada's role in such missions.

Canada has taken part in every United Nations operation of this kind, from Kashmir to Cyprus, as well as the truce commissions for Indochina. In announcing that Canada was taking the unprecedented step of withdrawing from a peace-observation group, Sharp suggested that other countries as well as his own should draw the conclusion that such operations ought to be "truly international," i.e., under U.N. authority. With the ICCS, he said, "There was no chance whatever that our concept of an impartial fact-finding team reporting quickly and reporting to an international authority would be accepted."

Canada's bid for a higher authority to which the ICCS could report, either U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim or the Security Council, was turned down at the Paris peace conference, with only Britain (co-chairman with the Soviet Union of the Geneva Accords) supporting Ottawa. Using Air America helicopters, the ICCS does better in the way of mobility than did the earlier control commissions, although all team sites have not been occupied. But perhaps partly because of Canada's "open-mouth" policy on the commission, four members with no chairman have not been able to agree any more readily than three members with a chairman. Sharp acknowledged that support by two commission members—Hungary and Poland—of the Communist side in Vietnam was pushing the other two members—Canada and Indonesia—into seeming to back the other side. In fact, Canadian neutrality was breaking down in Vietnam, and this as much as anything convinced the Trudeau government that it had to get out.

While Sharp himself has never been known to take an anti-U.S. stand, statements by Canada's commissioner in Vietnam, Michel Gauvin, were proving an increasing embarrassment. Gauvin, the ambassador to Greece, was chosen for the job because, as a former World War II combat officer, he gets along well with military types.

When an ICCS helicopter was downed in Vietcong territory April 7, Gauvin accepted the U.S. story (later disproved by Canadian investigators) that the wreckage was moved by Communist helicopters, and he never stopped insisting that North Vietnamese troops may have shot it down. He openly backed U.S. charges that fresh North Vietnamese troops were infiltrating into the South. The interrogation by Canadian and Indonesian officers of four captured North Vietnamese led to a proposed commission report blaming Hanoi, at which Hungary and Poland balked in a bitter dispute with Gauvin.

One is almost inclined to suspect that the Canadians picked a quarrel with their colleagues to demonstrate the commission's futility. Whether or not Canada would have announced its intention to withdraw if there were still heavy U.S. pressure to stay, there is no doubting Canadian faith in international ideals that simply are not present in Vietnam.

The ICCS was never meant to be a peacekeeping operation like Cyprus or the Congo or Pearson's U.N. emergency force in the Middle East. No military force is involved in overseeing a cease-fire and reporting on violations. But a common will toward peace by belligerents and observers alike is required, and the Canadians knew from the start that this was unlikely.

They are not sanguine enough to believe that peacekeeping or peace observation is easy anywhere, nor are they paragons of impartiality. But they are experienced in the conditions necessary for international peace supervision to work, and in leaving Vietnam they not only expose a phony peace but hint at the cooperative climate needed to make peace work anywhere. □

THE LESS MILITANT CAMPUS

NO RETREAT FROM COMMITMENT

STEPHEN R. WEISSMAN

Stanford

The students at the country's major universities have stopped seizing buildings and breaking windows, and the mass media are interpreting this as a retreat from social concerns and radical commitments. The president of Columbia University may have set the tone for countless commencement speeches by noting on his campus this year's "nostalgic rediscovery" of the "half-forgotten joys" and "golden optimism" of the 1950s.

Having spent the past year as a research associate at Stanford University, and after interviewing dozens of students, faculty members and administrators, I'm skeptical of these analyses. In fact, the students here maintain a high level of critical social and political consciousness, although its manifestations are less dramatic, disruptive of academic routines, and all-pervasive than they were in the days of mass mobilization. That significant minority which was more or less "radicalized" by the activism of recent years has become even more deeply committed to the struggle for major social changes. Far from being disillusioned, they are in general better organized and less millenarian, more strategy-oriented and less contaminated by the excesses of counter-culture "spontaneity."

And they have been refreshed by troops from new movements, particularly women and Chicanos, whose specific grievances often lead to more critical social perspectives. The new campus movement uses the gains of the 1960s—the institutionalizing of a critical opposition

Stephen Weissman, a political science research associate in the Stanford University Community Development Study, is the author of American Foreign Policy in the Congo, 1960-64, *to be published by the Cornell University Press.*

in the educational sphere, the opportunity to relate to off-campus political groups—to involve a large minority in a multitude of social issues. Indeed, the combined number of students doing such things as investigating prison conditions and responding to prisoners' legal and educational needs, organizing support for the United Farm Workers Union in its battle with the Teamsters and growers, studying and experimenting with curricula for free schools, working for McGovern as a step toward pushing the country to the Left, and setting up a counseling center on alternative, socially relevant vocations, is probably larger than the number who sat-in during 1969 and 1970.

There is, to be sure, less opportunity for casual participation, as by attending a mass rally, than there was in the apocalyptic days. There's even some breathing space for such conservative side phenomena as a mini-revival of fraternities and the flowering of the Jesus movement. But the reigning ideology is liberal. Campus resocialization carries a large minority of privileged white students to Left-liberal or radical positions, either through direct involvement in issues or by a less tangible cultural osmosis. The forms of political action do challenge the system, although they are less violent than those of an earlier period.

And Stanford may not be untypical of the current situation on America's "elite" campuses, from which the movement of the 1960s sprang. It is, if anything, more "bourgeois" and "suburban" than Harvard, Columbia, Berkeley and Cornell. According to the university's placement counselors, most Stanford students are sorely tempted to spend their lives, in whatever capacity, amid the enticing and distracting lushness of Palo Alto, Los Altos Hills and Portola Valley.

On examination, the notion of a return to the 1950s seems illusory. At the end of that decade Stanford had twenty-six fraternities and an overwhelming preference for Richard Nixon as the next President of the United States. By the mid-1960s, things had changed somewhat. David Harris returned from Mississippi summer, became student union president by appealing to students in the dorms rather than those in the fraternities, and started the Resistance. In 1969-71 several hundred among Stanford's 11,000 students were willing, at appropriate moments, to become involved in high-risk, forceful action against the university's military research and ROTC programs. Several thousand others rallied to support these demands and heard far-reaching criticisms of American society. A majority of these voted, in special referenda, for the demilitarization of the university, American withdrawal from Southeast Asia, the Panther demand for liberation of all political prisoners, and the reinstatement of radical Prof. H. Bruce Franklin who was fired in a *cause célèbre* of academic freedom for such alleged incidents as encouraging students to shut down a Computation Center where a war-related program was being run off. (See "The Discontents of Stanford" by Sherman B. Chickering, *The Nation*, March, 13, 1972.)

This year only fourteen fraternities remain; 80 per cent of student voters went for George McGovern; the newly installed student government is every bit as activist and Left-leaning as its recent predecessors, although the *Stanford Daily* has acquired a less militant (but liberal) staff. The number of students enrolled in Stanford Workshops on Political and Social Issues (SWOPSI), a sort of counter-curriculum for credit which resulted from Movement agitation, has doubled in the past year. Student leaders of varying political persuasions characterize the present phase as one of "high consciousness and low mobilization." Faculty members with whom I spoke tended to agree. Asst. Prof. Ward Watt, who teaches introductory biology, observed that his students are more persevering and "less distracted by mass excitation" than three years ago, but adds, "They are quite interested in social problems. I've never found as much interest in the connections between science and these other questions. I don't think there are indications that they're moving down and turning in." John Mollenkopf, an assistant professor of political science, has noted that his classes are "shot through with a large number of people who were permanently changed by anti-war stuff, the Movement, who talk of intellectual issues but are sometimes confused about current directions." In the Law School, Prof. Anthony Amsterdam believes that the "marked change" in law student activism that resulted from the 1960s has persisted in this less noisy era. He detects "no decrease in social consciousness" in the last two or three years. The dean of undergraduate admissions, Fred Hargadon, flatly states that "a large majority of candidates accepted are socially conscious and concerned with issues." Although Hargadon is skeptical as to the depth of their commitment and regards the rapid succession of issues as a symptom of "media other-direction," he has become accustomed to application essays on Vietnam, racism and ecology, rather than "My Experiences Fishing with Maine Lobstermen."

Why, then, has the largest mass mobilization this year been a quiet rally of 800 in January, following Nixon's decision to bomb for peace in North Vietnam? According to Dan Brenner, a junior who is opinions editor of the *Daily*, "Students today are less prone to go out on the Embarcadero and get arrested because they feel it is not an effective technique." Brent Appel, a former student union co-president who is in his fifth year at Stanford, explains, "The issue is what I can do. Demonstrations are not seen as viable—all has been heard before, it's not novel now, the average Middle American won't be reached. People are looking for new tactics." Past mobilizations also created an ideological momentum which was bound to undermine the logic of the initial tactics. Bob Saunders, another fifth-year student who is also an alternative vocations counselor, thinks: "People's expectations got to be higher than their tactics, which couldn't themselves change society. Even if you got the Defense Department off campus [which largely occurred], the capitalist structure and imperialism survived." Bruce Franklin, now laboring off campus as a member of the Central Committee of Venceremos, a Marxist-Leninist organization, speaks of the "apparent paradox" of "a low level of militant activity and high consciousness": "Because people have a high level of consciousness they don't see what they can do about [oppression]."

Another important factor in the subsidence of large

eruptions has been the removal of draft pressures. In the context of Vietnam, conscription was more than a personal threat; it was, in Appel's phrase, "a symbol of government coercion at your back door." Radical organizers today have not found a similar cross-cutting incentive for campus mobilization. Finally, the labor market and graduate school gluts have undoubtedly taken some toll of activism even at a prestige school like Stanford.

But while the shift away from mass mobilization has left some of the more casual former participants feeling frustrated, powerless, and occasionally cynical, that has not been the general reaction of those who were more deeply touched. There is widespread agreement with Appel's judgment that "the number of people who really commit a substantial part of their lives to social change is increasing." Furthermore, as *Daily* columnist Bill Evers points out, "The new New Left is more organized, less hedonistic and politically crazy. Achievement orientation has come back more and there's a more sensible time horizon." Leslie Rabine, a graduate student who has been active organizing women's groups remarks, "At the point where the Movement was generally at its height there was a lot of reliance on spontaneity. Now there's better organization, more solid ties. It's much more serious and long range." In organizing students, the new New Left has emphasized both consciousness raising and meaningful action. And it has made good use of the post-1960s educational revolution: greater openness of the campus to outside social change groups and the incorporation of a significant number of student-initiated, action-oriented courses. Here follow some examples of current activity.

Student government co-president Kevin O'Grady, a first-year medical student, headed the local McGovern campaign which involved more than 400 people. With other McGovern workers and veterans of the Movement he formed SCOPE (Stanford Committee on Political Education) which recently presented a four-day conference focusing on domestic repression. The most prominent of eight Left-liberal and radical speakers was Daniel Ellsberg, who attracted 1,600 spectators. Ten years ago major universities did not countenance public appearances by individuals under indictment.

Through SWOPSI, a group of students is researching

Speak Out

Because this is the season of commencements, The Nation *here reprints an edited version of what is perhaps the finest commencement address ever delivered in America. John Jay Chapman gave it, in the spring of 1900, to the graduating class of Hobart College. The full text of this address is to be found in* The Collected Works of John Jay Chapman *(Volume VI), published in 1970 by M & S Press, Weston, Mass.*

You believe that the abuses under the Russian Government are inscrutably different from and worse than our own; whereas both sets of atrocities are identical in principle, and are more alike in fact, in taste and smell and substance than your prejudice is willing to admit.

Life is not a boarding school where a bad boy can be dismissed for the benefit of the rest. He remains. He must be dealt with. He is as much here as we are ourselves.

The voice of humanity is stifled by corruption; and corruption is only an evil because it stifles men.

Try to raise a voice that shall be heard from here to Albany and watch what it is that comes forward to shut off the sound. It is not a German sergeant, nor a Russian officer of the precinct. It is a note from a friend of your father's, offering you a place in his office.

This is your warning from the secret police. Why, if any of you young gentlemen have a mind to make himself heard a mile off, you must make a bonfire of your reputations and a close enemy of most men who wish you well.

I have seen ten years of young men who rush out into the world with their messages, and when they find how deaf the world is, they think they must save their strength and wait. They believe that after a while they will be able to get up on some little eminence from which they can make themselves heard. "In a few years," reasons one of them, "I shall have gained a standing, and then, I will use my power for good." Next year comes and with it a strange discovery. The man has lost his horizon of thought. His ambition has evaporated; he has nothing to say.

Social and business prominence look like advantages, and so they are if you want money. But if you want moral influence you may bless God you have not got them.

They are the payment with which the world subsidizes men to keep quiet, and there is no subtlety or cunning by which you can get them without paying in silence.

This is the great law of humanity, that has existed since history began, and will last while man lasts—evil, selfishness and silence are one thing.

When I was asked to make this address I wondered what I had to say to you boys who are graduating. And I think I have one thing to say: If you wish to be useful, never take a course that will silence you. Refuse to learn anything that you cannot proclaim. Refuse to accept anything that implies collusion, whether it be a clerkship or a curacy, a legal fee or a post in a university.

Retain the power of speech, no matter what other power you lose. If you can take this course, and insofar as you take it, you will bless this country. Insofar as you depart from this course you become dampers, mutes and hooded executioners.

As for your own private character it will be preserved by such a course. Crime you cannot commit, for crime gags you. Collusion with any abuse gags you.

As a practical matter a mere failure to speak out upon occasions where no opinion is asked or expected of you, and when the utterance of an uncalled-for suspicion is odious, will often hold you to a concurrence in palpable iniquity. It will bind and gag you and lay you dumb and in shackles like the veriest serf in Russia.

I give you this one rule of conduct. Do what you will, but speak out always.

Be shunned, be hated, be ridiculed, be scared, be in doubt, but don't be gagged.

The time of trial is always. Now is the appointed time.

practical health-care alternatives for farm workers, in response to "an agricultural and economic system which values profits and productivity more than people, combined with a health-care system which creates barriers to accessibility and acceptability of health services." All research will be made available to the farm workers and their appropriate community organizations. Moreover, a number of students plan to join a larger group from Stanford which will work with the United Farm Workers this summer in their battle against the Teamster-grower alliance.

Senior Elaine Wong, who started some of the first women's study groups at Stanford, estimates that up to 200 women are actively involved in SWOPSI and other student-initiated courses focusing on women's liberation. Women's caucuses are active in the Law and Medical Schools as well as in some undergraduate departments. For most of the women organizers with whom I spoke, liberation goes beyond careerism to the redefinition of alienating occupations and institutions. A group of white women joined their Chicana sisters in picketing a department store which was selling Farah slacks.

Approximately fifty law students are active in prison, civil liberties and rights, or legal aid work. Fifteen undergraduates are getting a first-hand look at prison through a SWOPSI project, teaching black and Chicano studies and general education to inmates at Soledad.

One of the most important indications of deepening commitment has been the profusion of student-conceived courses on alternative vocations. Through policy research and direct practice, many students are learning about such structural experiments as free clinics and migrant labor health centers, free schools, law communes and the alternative media. Synergy Center, devoted to the integration of new, socially meaningful vocations and life styles, is training twenty-five counselors through a SWOPSI course. In the academic sphere, future professors of leftist bent have formed study groups in at least the following departments: History, Political Science and Economics.

Most of this activity is publicized in the *Daily* and has some influence on general student consciousness. For instance, a small demonstration against fraternity sexism is said to have dominated dinner conversations in some dorms for weeks.

Black students have always been chary of joining the white movement at Stanford. At the moment, according to black student union president Charles Ogletree, "The emphasis is on acquiring the best resources available to achieve educational success." Former black student leader Mike Dawson, who graduated last year and now works for Stanford Linear Accelerator, confirms that "As of a year ago, one trend was to more interest in the classical professions and a decrease in community involvement. Earlier there was more talk of the university as a laboratory to practice skills in the community. Recently there has been less interest in political and more in cultural issues." Although there are exceptions, this seems to portray the general drift. Perhaps it is an inevitable characteristic of first-generation-in-college, upwardly mobile ethnics, but some think that rising admissions requirements for blacks and the withdrawal of the Panthers from the campuses have also played a role. The less firmly established Chicanos, who can look to the example of Cesar Chavez, have been somewhat more active.

With the end of the shattering mass mobilizations of the late 1960s, conservative groupings have picked up a bit. There has been an increase in the number of students choosing to live in fraternities, but nothing very spectacular. The principal manifestation of conservative political thought is the Radical Libertarian organization which has about sixty members. But its program, a hybrid of Milton Friedman economic liberalism and New Left anti-militarism, would give cold comfort to Richard Nixon or David Packard.

Perhaps the largest and most rapidly growing group on campus is the amorphous "Jesus movement." It is sponsored by evangelical Protestant organizations and appears to have a few hundred followers. Previously based mainly in Western high schools, it ran a highly successful canvassing operation in the freshman dorms this year. The movement offers peace and joy through a personal relationship with Jesus, who is considered to be an active force shaping people's lives. It stands for many of the old tenets of fundamentalist morality but has imparted a new flexibility toward youthful indiscretions, clothing styles and even women's lib. Its characteristic activities are Bible study sessions, which have incorporated some aspects of encounter groups; joint prayer, and summer retreats. For the fairly conservative young people who embrace it (a good many are athletes), it seems to provide an antidote to competitive personal relations, self-doubt, indecision and institutional impersonality that they do not find in "good works" Christianity. Freshman Carol Sawyer expressed some themes which recurred in my conversations with Jesus people:

> I was hung up on decisions, relations with people, how I was going to change things—I haven't such control. Now that I have Christ, He guides me in my decision. No matter which way I go I don't get hung up on it. No matter where I go I have a peace about my decision. I'm less self-centered—He's helped me. I can get along better with some, have understanding and love for them, through my relation with Christ. When I came to Stanford I knew some Christians. I noticed they were like little lights—so happy, joyful, had a peace, weren't upset. I found out some even prayed for me when I blew an exam or my mom was mad at me. They related to me on a very personal, interested basis. The Lord has special timing for me. They had something. I wanted their peace and joy.

However inwardly turning and apolitical, the Jesus movement is no return to the values of the 1950s. It seems more connected to the social strains that gave rise to the counter-culture of the 1960s. Its followers are critical of the competitive insecurity and empty materialism of American life, and disillusioned by the failure of national power, science and sometimes the student movement to solve these problems. Many have come to the Jesus movement after experiences with drugs or Eastern religions.

Needless to say, college students of the industrialized Western nations can never by themselves be a decisive revolutionary force. But, as events in France and the

United States have shown, they can be the cutting edge of a troubled society. If their movements are marked by the impermanence of their educational experience, it is also true that the young, by their self-definitions, have shaped "political generations." (Nearly all the Stanford student leaders of the 1960s are now in "alternative vocations" which permit them to continue their work for political change.) Kenneth Keniston and others have shown that the contradictions of our society have produced large numbers of "committed" or "alienated" young people who come together in many of our best universities. As a result of the 1960s, these universities are even more open to political thought and practice than they were in the 1950s. While the forms of involvement have responded to changing external conditions, the critical thrust seems firmly established. □

AFTER BUFFALO CREEK

BUREAUCRACY OF DISASTERS

TOM NUGENT

Perched high on the western flank of the Appalachian Mountains, Buffalo Creek Hollow, W. Va., is a narrow, 17-mile-long valley where 5,000 people once lived in a string of sixteen coal-mining settlements. At one minute past eight on the morning of February 26, 1972, a massive, coal-waste dam, operated by a New York conglomerate's coal-mining subsidiary and located at the very top of the hollow suddenly collapsed. Within three hours, the worst flood in West Virginia history killed 125 people, destroyed almost 1,000 homes, and caused at least $50 million in property damage.

Today, more than fifteen months after the break in the dam, the larger dimensions of the Buffalo Creek tragedy are becoming apparent. The disaster no longer produces nationwide headlines, since its most visible effects—the dramatic deaths and the catastrophic property losses—were long ago reported. Gradually, however, many of the flood victims have begun to realize that the worst part of the disaster actually came in the weeks and months which followed the dam's collapse.

Most of the flood victims were uprooted from the land on which they had lived for generations, and resettled among strangers, in rows of identical, government trailers. Many of them began to develop psychological problems, irrational phobias and guilts which psychologists say are directly traceable to the killer flood. Some of the survivors say they have been forced to haggle, endlessly and infuriatingly, with tight-fisted coal company adjusters who refuse to make fair payment for property losses.

Worst of all, perhaps, the vast majority of Buffalo Creek's former inhabitants have been required to sit in their temporary trailers, helplessly idle, while a whole portfolio of ambitious, elegantly drawn government plans to rebuild their valley first faltered, then stalled, then virtually died in a snarl of red tape. After more than a year of optimistic press releases, citizens' meetings and government pledges to "Turn Buffalo Creek into a model community" had produced nothing concrete, U.S. Sen. Jennings Randolph declared on April 10 that "Assistance and aid from the federal government . . . have, in my judgment, deteriorated to the extent that the lack of progress in the rebuilding effort is a disaster itself." Equally critical, area Rep. Ken Hechler has persuaded the Government Accounting Office to investigate the mess.

What happens to a place like Buffalo Creek after the dead have been buried, the wreckage has been carted away and the newsmen have moved on to the next story? Many of the problems which developed after the West Virginia flood were inevitable; they could be expected in the wake of any large-scale disaster. Others were directly related to the politics of the Nixon Administration, with its insistence on tight, centralized control of government functions and its emphasis on vote-getting public relations rather than performance. Finally, a large share of the difficulties has arisen because many federal assistance programs, while reasonably effective in a short-term, emergency situation, are inadequate when it comes to rebuilding a disaster area.

"Those people on Buffalo Creek have been getting screwed all their lives," says a top official at the West Virginia Statehouse, "and they're still getting screwed today. We're trying to change that—but it isn't as easy as it looks." Whatever the causes, it seems clear that the Buffalo Creek disaster has not yet ended, and that it's not likely to end in the near future.

Three different government agencies investigated the disaster. They laid the responsibility for the flood squarely on the shoulders of Buffalo Mining, and on its corporate parent, Pittston. They concluded that the defective dam had been built in violation of several laws, that its construction had been absurdly unscientific, and that the coal companies had shown "flagrant disregard for the safety of residents of Buffalo Creek."

And that, basically, was where the matter ended. Buffalo Mining drew a $25 fine for breaking a U.S. Bureau of Mines regulation, and a mild scolding from the U.S. Department of the Interior. (Thruston Morton, who sits on the Pittston board of directors, is the brother of Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior.) Several Buffalo Mining officials were required to answer questions before a Logan County grand jury, but emerged

Tom Nugent worked on the Detroit Free Press *and the Charlotte* Observer. *His* Death at Buffalo Creek *will be published by W. W. Norton on July 16.*