

19 May 70



## Students Return To Test System

WASHINGTON — Sporadic violence is still breaking out on some college campuses—interestingly enough, even at such unradical places as the University of South Carolina and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. But it is now clear that the primary response of students to the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State deaths is quite different. They have returned to “the system,” even to the “old politics,” with a vigor and ingenuity that has astonished many politicians. So a major question now is what the response will be from “the system.”

All last week, student and faculty lobbyists roamed Capitol Hill, working for yeas on such proposals to limit the war as the Church-Cooper amendment (putting Cambodia off limits to American forces after July 1) or the McGovern-Hatfield resolution (which would cut off funds for the whole war by mid-1971).

Under the auspices of Dartmouth College, a “continuing presence in Washington” office, complete with computer, has been set up on Connecticut Avenue to coordinate the lobbying effort, and to keep new groups coming in.

Others are organizing something called Project Pursestrings, a citizens’ group supporting the McGovern-Hatfield proposal and which claims to have nearly 100 colleges lined up to send student-faculty-alumni delegations here in the coming weeks. The group also aims to organize letter-writing and other campaigns in the home states and congressional districts of members of Congress whom it considers open to persuasion.

Then there are law students against the war, who are organizing law school delegations. Such ad hoc groups as a delegation of North Carolinians who are students at Northeastern universities have been button-holing congressmen and senators, and more established organizations—for instance, Referendum ’70 and the Young Republican Ripon Society—are taking on new energy.

On the campus itself, the new activist organizations can hardly be counted. Princeton began the movement to make two weeks available to students next fall for working for or against congressional candidates; this practice obviously will be followed by many other schools.

This is by no means a com-

plete accounting of what is happening, but it is perhaps enough to support the moving remarks of John Dixon, a university of North Carolina professor who came with students to visit that state’s congressional delegation, and told its members:

“It is vital to know that the students you see around you are not radicals or rebels. . . . They passionately believe that what we are doing in Vietnam, in Cambodia, in Laos, is un-American, unpatriotic, and an offense against the basic principles which should give meaning to our country. . . . Their response has been one of the most extraordinary political phenomena of our time. . . . They have done exactly what we have told them all along to do—they have come forward once more within the system.”

“They are now the moral conscience of the nation. . . for perhaps the last time in this generation, they are back in the system. God grant that the system will be worthy of them.”

But how is it to be demonstrated that it is? Thousands of other patriotic Americans express their patriotism through support of the President and his stated efforts to end the war; others, strange as it may seem, see patriotism in prosecuting the war even more vigorously.

It cannot really be argued, therefore, that whether Congress passes the McGovern-Hatfield resolution is an all-encompassing and final test of democracy and “the system.”

What has to be determined, nevertheless, is whether, in the Nuclear Age, Congress and the people have let the war-making power slip beyond any feasible democratic control, and whether, in the instant case, the political and propagandistic powers of the presidency and the military make the war basically invulnerable even to massive popular opposition. Only if so has “the system” truly failed.

(C. 1970, New York Times Service)