

Incidentally, my fourth category of Christians, those who react to the Middle East situation out of a fair knowledge of international affairs, need not be so baffling. They are simply those people who are sufficiently concerned about their brothers and sisters overseas to go to some pains to read and keep informed concerning the mind and soul of the people who actually work and live and die in these distant parts of the world. Certainly this is a segment of our population, small though it may be, which a department of history of a state university would know something about.

Scottish Nationalism

To the Editors: As an ex-Glaswegian I found James Kellas's December article ("Scottish Nationalism & Other Passions") altogether too facile and misleading.

The assumption that an independent Scotland would be too small to be economically viable is patent nonsense. Norway has a still smaller population, even less endowed with natural resources, yet with a standard of living immeasurably higher than Britain's.

Britain's economy floundered not because of insufficient size, but because incompetent governments compounded the problems caused by archaic union structures and antediluvian management.

There is no guarantee that an independent Scottish government would be more competent. But neither is there any valid reason to dismiss the potential of a capable government, willing and able to ensure that Scotland retains a greater proportion of generated profits than hitherto possible.

C. G. Jacobsen
Center for International Affairs
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

James G. Kellas Responds:
I did not write that an independent Scotland would be too small to be economically viable, but that separa-

tion was "unlikely to have desirable economic effects." I also said that if a nation were too small, separation would be "politically and economically unrealistic." All this seems true in the context of the British Isles and was endorsed by the non-party Commission on the Constitution. Nevertheless, North Sea oil has made Scotland a richer country than it was when the Commission did its work, and if there were a strong desire for separation, it could certainly work, up to a point. I feel, however, that the difficulty of separating off the Scottish economy from that of the rest of the U.K. (or indeed the EEC) still renders that solution "unrealistic." It is only through a mixture of centralized (European) authority and decentralized national or regional governments that the problems can be properly tackled.

"The Conscience of a Soldier"

To the Editors: Since *Worldview* and CRIA have chosen to adopt Josiah Bunting as a model of how to discuss and deal with such issues as "resignation" and "patriotism," his remarks in the December *Worldview* ("The Conscience of a Soldier") deserve special attention and, as I hope to make clear, they should be compared with your editorial position. Faced with deciding whether Bunting is extremely naive or an extremely ambitious bureaucrat of the type he allegedly deplores, I reluctantly conclude it is the latter.

First off, Bunting obviously is acting out the role he has chosen and, given his current position, is doing it quite well. As he points out, this is not 1946, hence no recent professional military officer becomes a college president (or even an assistant professor!) unless he makes it abundantly clear to those to whom he applies that he is not one of "them" (the military stereotype). One wonders exactly what Bunting said to the Briarcliff search committee during the competitive struggle to become its president (unless he was the *only* candidate). In all likelihood

there was some fond reminiscence of Oxford (as carefully inserted in his reprinted speech), perhaps to remind them of his nonmilitary identity and to imply that *his* repeated requests to leave Oxford for Vietnam were motivated only because he was "convinced that what we were doing there was necessary." (The necessity to "get certain tickets punched" and to be "competitive for promotion later" only drove *other* professionals, not our hero.) Surely Bunting is not so naive as to seriously believe that a college president is not a "political" man, is not engaged in deadly bureaucratic competition (something editor James Finn understands ["Varieties of Resignation," *Connections*, December], but Bunting professes not to). If he does believe this, however, Briarcliff is in for a rough time. The institutional leader who does not understand the effect of his authority upon others (faculty, staff, students) is likely to make some terrible decisions for the "good of the institution." On the available evidence, Bunting is the epitome of the bright and ambitious young man, and one can only wonder how he will escalate his attacks on the Army in order to get his next promotion.

At least one of his suggestions for improvement is remarkably one-sided. It may well be the case that many general officer positions could be filled by "intelligent amateurs from the other professions" because, in an unguarded moment, Bunting admits that all bureaucracies share "common problems." Unless he deliberately seeks to be vindictive, however, why isn't the reverse equally valid? Or, following his own example, are we to assume that only those who "resign in protest" from the military are to be considered suitable for positions in other bureaucracies? Worse yet, for a man who feels uncomfortable "striving with political men," why the interest in appointing generals from political parties? As for the "ombudsman" idea, this seems the single demonstration of consummate naiveté. Surely it should be clear by now that the U.S. Congress operates as