

## in the magazines

It may seem "a contradiction in terms" to discuss "Women & the Draft," says the National Council to Repeal the Draft's (NCRD) associate director, Josephine Lee Davis, but "there are many reasons why women are vitally interested in, and opposed to, the draft" (NCRD Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 10).

"The fact that lower-income and non-white men are drafted in disproportionate numbers is not lost on women; neither is the fact that men are drafted from unrepresented regions, such as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. We have watched our high school friends—often gentle people—'go away' to the Army and return as conditioned supporters of militaristic foreign policy. We have seen the draft alienate these men from themselves, and thus, on a large scale, alienate huge numbers of people from independent thought and autonomous participation in society. We have attended funerals; we have visited resisters in jail. We have seen men's lives, and those they affect, disastrously altered by their attempts to obtain educational, marriage, paternity, and psychological/physical deferments. Most important, women, committed to life support and increasingly conscious of the insidious subtlety of compulsion, are natural enemies of conscription—a system which disregards the value of human life and uses people indifferently and capriciously to destroy other human beings, with little other cause than 'saving face' for the 'helpless giant.' . . .

"Perhaps one reason women were not included in the military's concept of the draft to date was that suppression was an accomplished fact. With the growing liberation of women we will surely see a change in this; many opponents of the Women's Rights Amendment feel that just this will be the case. Women were omitted from the House National Service bill only to avoid suits of unconstitutionality on grounds of the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing involuntary servitude, NCRD staff has been told. Accordingly, if there is a chance we can stop what is already a form of slavery by being included in it, then by all means, let's insist on it! . . ."

•

From "Journalism: 1970—Uncertain Oracles," by Harry S. Ashmore, in *The Center Magazine*:

"It is generally held that Mr. Nixon's skillful use of television exceeds anything known before, even though his immediate predecessor certainly set a frenetic pace. As a candidate Mr. Nixon simply refused to expose himself to the questions of independent journalists; instead he relied on record amounts of paid advertising in which carefully staged 'dialogues' were presented in similar format. Things haven't changed perceptibly since. . . .

"This kind of power is now being employed by Mr. Nixon's news managers to expunge the record on those occasions when the President suffers a verbal lapse, as in the case of his reference to the Charles Manson murder trial, or blatantly contradicts his earlier pronouncements, as he has done frequently in statements on school integration and the Cambodian invasion. Some of these embarrassments are inevitable in the nature of the office, and there probably has never been a President who didn't do some fudging in his own, or what he deemed to be the public, interest. The normally restrained *New Yorker* magazine, however, discerns a significant departure: 'This new kind of lying, similar to the Big Lie practiced in totalitarian countries—in which the government tries to convince the public of a grossly false but self-consistent version of the facts—is nonetheless different, because it destroys all consistency, even the internal consistency of the government's position. In short, the government defies and obliterates its own word, and policy statements become unintelligible as well as untruthful. When this happens, the points of certainty that might serve as a common basis for constructive discussion are lost, and the kind of rational public debate that is essential to the functioning of a democracy becomes impossible.'"

•

In a speech delivered last summer and reprinted in a recent issue of *Survival*, French Defense Minister Michel Debré outlined the primary concerns of his nation's defense policy. Addressing at one point the critics of France's go-it-alone attitude, Debré writes:

"Life throughout the world is based, and will be based in the coming years, upon nation-states, and the foundation of all security for men, women and their homes will be the political and military ability of nation-states to guarantee, in as far as that is possible, their security. France does not stand outside that law. Not to acknowledge that would be to resign ourselves to the fact that our interests and our liberty would be undefended, except to the extent that those interests and that liberty were considered to be part of the interests and the liberty of others. And that is a gamble which I would not commend to anyone . . . .

"That is not to say that no sense of European purpose exists within Europe. There is a sense of European economic purpose: we see it in the Common Market and in the plans for its evolution. There is a sense of European psychological purpose: we see it in the general will to avoid internal conflicts within Europe and to subordinate disagreements to

(Continued on p. 20)