

without government contributions derived from the higher-income groups.

The Federal grants for pensions in old age, to dependent mothers, to the blind, and to varied child-welfare and public-health activities are sound and constitutional. They mark truly advanced steps and genuine progress. The unemployment insurance and old-age contributory insurance plans, however, are administratively and socially unwise.

The Future

The social security program, which has just been embodied in an Act of Congress, represents a most significant step in our national development. It is a milestone in our progress toward a better ordered society, providing, as it does, the majority of our people with a substantial measure of security in infancy and childhood, in economic crises of their working life, and in their old age. It should be one of the forces working against the recurrence of severe depressions in the future. We can, as the principle of sustained purchasing power in hard times makes itself felt in every shop and store and mill, grow old without being haunted by the spectre of a poverty-ridden old age or of being a burden on our children.

In one great stride, the Social Security law seeks to bring us abreast of the social-security legislation that a few European countries have tested for a generation or more.

The objectives at which the bill aims are now generally accepted by enlightened opinion. They are not cure-alls, but mitigations of some of the chief economic contingencies of life—the fear of want and starvation from the sudden loss of a job, and the fear of poverty and homelessness in old age.

The Social Security Act should make our country a better and a happier place in which to live—for us, our children, and their children.

HELEN PULLIAM

LIBERTY IN THE COLLEGE OPPOSING OPINIONS AS VOICED IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

CONTROL IN PLACE OF WORSE PENALTIES

DURING his undergraduate years a student is being shaped in body, mind, and spirit by many forces, good and bad. Of course the central influence of that period is the organized instruction for which the faculty alone is responsible. But life for the boy embraces more than this. He has his home experiences, his religious contacts and his reactions to the world of literature and art, of business and of public affairs.

Furthermore he seeks, with his fellows, to carry on activities under the general college sanction and on its grounds. The relation of the faculty to undergraduate athletics, publications, dormitories and fraternities, discussion groups, eating clubs, class politics and interclass rivalries is difficult to define in any hard and fast manner.

A charter to guide such matters was granted to the students by the trustees of the City College with this preamble:

"Recognizing the value of extracurriculum activities in college life and appreciating the need for the orderly development and democratic control of such activities so far as possible by the students themselves, and furthermore desiring to inculcate in the student body a realization of the importance of self-discipline, the trustees of the College of the City of New York, on the recommendation of the president, hereby grant to the student body the powers and duties set forth in the following articles, reserving always the right to amend or revoke the same."

A College's Responsibility

Clearly our trustees, like others, recognize that they are responsible to the public, parents and to the students themselves for

all that goes on under the college name. They cannot shirk final responsibility nor do they seek to do so. While granting the students a generous range of freedom in which to exercise initiative and self-control, they reserve the right to modify practices which in their judgment require modification.

They are theoretically "in loco parentis," but in practice they depend upon the faculty to exercise the parental functions. If a parent is tyrannical, arbitrary, hard and unsympathetic he will not only lose the respect and love of his children but he will do them positive harm. In like manner, if he permits them to indulge without restraint in the exercise of immature and transitory whims, he will spoil them, retard sane development and subject the community to unwarranted annoyances. The older generation must guide the younger, not encourage it to run wild.

Undergraduates are beset with the storm and stress of adolescence and young manhood and their impulses though usually altruistic are often based on partial information and spring from inexperience and undue emotion.

If left wholly without faculty advice, guidance and ultimate control, the athletes would neglect their studies and for the joys of victories on the fields of sport sacrifice future victories of science, letters, and civic progress; undergraduate publishers would contract debts which others would have to pay and bring discredit upon themselves and their colleges by overstepping the bounds of decent journalism; discussion groups would become the catspaws of outside agitators and embroil the college in matters foreign to the purpose of its foundation. All experienced educators recognize these dangers and consider it their duty to safeguard against them.

Students, in the nature of the situation, cannot have continuity of experience. Each group, if left alone, would tend to repeat the

mistakes of its predecessors. Students come and go; faculties remain and grow wise in the ways of youth. Of course, even the faculties make mistakes, but unbiased history testifies to their general patience, kindness, and sympathy.

FREDERICK B. ROBINSON,
President College of the City of New York

SUPPRESSION DEVICES DO NOT SUPPRESS

THERE are two ways of analyzing the problem of student freedom in matters of "speech, publication, and assembly." First is that of judging the educational effect upon the students themselves of liberty of discussion and protest versus censorship, suppression, and parietal protections on the part of college administrative officers. Second is the effect of these opposing policies upon the institutional reputation. Both ways of approach seem to me to lead to the same conclusions.

The inescapable fact with regard to academic devices of suppression is that they do not suppress. Indeed, the effect upon students is strangely perverse—as perverse as that upon naughty children when punished by irate parents. To forbid student publication is to increase the reading and discussion of the thing forbidden. To prohibit student assemblies or to pronounce a tabu on subjects or speakers is to drive them not even underground but across the street into a bigger hall with a larger and more attentive audience.

It requires not much insight to see that in a world of newspapers, magazines, books, radio, movies, and endless public talk it is impossible to keep the college student from access to the new, the bizarre, the fanatical, the dark and ignorant criticisms, the bright and fragile utopias of our time. In the interest of sound thinking, of the development of critical judgment, and of a sense of values they should certainly have that access.

For a Safety Valve

Where more harmlessly than in the cool academic groves can the steam of protest and discontent escape?

Suppress protests and bizarre notions, hide them indoors, send them outside the campus walls, and they immediately become glamorous and important far beyond their desert. Give them a free and normal part in the life of the college and they will serve as source material for development of mature thinking and for judgment freed from the emotional results of childish protests, fears, and antagonisms. Clearly, freedom and tolerance in these matters lead to a sounder educational result than the necessarily futile and dramatic combats resulting from authoritarian censorship.

Frequently, however, college administrators in their acts of suppression and reprisal are not thinking of the students but of the outside public, especially of parents, donors, or legislators. The morning's mail brings the protests, fears, and prejudices of those whose good-will the institution covets or needs.

The administrators know that an offending student editorial is based upon ignorance of facts and that often the student meeting brings into prominence attitudes unrepresentative of the student body as a whole. And so, with sincere regard for the good name of the college, they attempt quietly to put the institutional skeleton in the closet and stand uncomfortably against the door.

The trouble is that the skeleton inside the closet has a way of rattling so loudly that it attracts more attention and frightens more people than if it were in full view. The way to the front page of metropolitan newspapers is usually the way of censorship and suppression.

Institution vs. Individual

Responsible journalism, with careful regard for facts and comparative values, we do not often have inside or outside the college walls. But we do not promote responsi-

bility by censorship; we probably do not promote it by neglect. We do promote it through holding student editors and outside speakers responsible for their errors by fair, open, and competent criticism and disagreement.

I say nothing about the suppressions in their own interest by college authorities of criticisms directed at the food, football, the faculty, or the architecture of our institutions. Change is the law of academic life and it is often initiated by student criticism. For college authorities to seek exemption from such criticism is wrong and almost always futile.

Nor do I say anything about freedom or individual liberty as a natural or legal right. I am arguing only for the wisdom of recognizing free student speech, publication, and assembly as an agency of sound education and as a policy of administrative prudence.

ROBERT D. LEIGH,

President Bennington College

LULLABY A LA MODE

Go to sleep, darling, sweet peace to your soul!

Mother will pray for your motor control;
Check up statistics on mental hygiene;
Look at your brain through an X-ray machine.

Hushaby, darling, it's mother's ambition
To get your reflexes into condition.

Mother is wise in the new sociology,
Psycho-analysis, endocrinology.

She'd like to sing to you, but the psychologists,

Pre-school authorities, learned biologists,
Ban lullabies for the kids of the nation,
Lest they develop the "mother-fixation."
Make your "Good-night" scientific and formal;

Don't run the risk of a complex abnormal.
Angels are watching o'er each nerve and gland.

Hushaby, lullaby. Ain't science grand!

—*Author Unknown.*