

THE COLLEGES

Bring Back In Loco Parentis

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*; Richard Nixon: *The Man Behind The Mask*; Nixon's *Palace Guard*; and, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* — a sensational new best-seller with six million copies already in print. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ FOR generations it has been part of the American dream for parents to send their sons and daughters to college. A college degree has been thought of almost superstitiously as a ticket to a better life, a passkey to "upward mobility." Parents have gladly endured hardships to provide such education, expecting that their sacrifice would assure their children a better life. And, as a result, millions of Americans did indeed have it better than their parents.

Millions of Americans are still sacrificing their own comfort and standard of living to send Jimmy and Susie to college. Parents who can ill afford it pay \$4,000 to \$5,000 per year per child, dreaming of a day when they may attend a graduation ceremony and watch with love and pride as James and Susan accept their diplomas. But, with ever-increasing frequency, such dreams are becoming nightmares. Full of high hopes, parents send Jimmy and Susie off to Big U. Soon Susie, the former high-school cheerleader who was so clean and fresh that she

almost sparkled, has taken a male "room-mate" and spends more and more of her time in the escapism of drugs. Jimmy, the high-school debate champion, has become a bearded Trotskyite determined to "destroy the system." And both brother and sister make no secret of the fact that they consider their middle-class parents to be boors, phonies, and hypocrites.

For this, a devoted father scrimped and saved and carried his lunch in a brown paper bag. For this a loving mother left the home she loves and took a part-time job. For this they poured out \$40,000 — twice what they paid for their little suburban home.

This scenario may seem hyperbolic, but for many American families this nightmare has become a reality. If it has not happened in your family, you know parents who have suffered the experience. Bewildered and stunned, they wonder where they failed.

During the past two years all has seemed quiet on the collegiate front. No more Columbias. No more Kent States. Concern about the campus has almost disappeared from the nightly news and the covers of slick magazines. But while what is now happening on the campus is not so overtly annoying as students kidnapping deans and staging loot-ins, it is far more dangerous.

Violence has faded for a number of reasons. Chief among them is that Richard Nixon's adroit sellout in Vietnam has stripped the radicals of their ability to involve more-moderate students in revolutionary protests. Many students began to see violence as counter-productive. It became impossible to sustain the fervid

emotional pitch, and tedium set in when radical activism became a commonplace. As J. Leighton Read, student president at Rice University, observed: "The major issues capable of getting people emotionally involved have sort of melted away." College presidents and administrators began to wink knowingly at each other and congratulated themselves when their "campus reforms" defused organized protests by the simple expedient of surrendering to whatever militant students demanded. Meanwhile, Maoism has been hung in the closet, at least temporarily, and Lord Fabian has returned to the throne under a banner declaring: "Work within the system!"

The weather has changed but not the climate. Current surveys show that incoming freshmen are less radical than in recent years. But, disturbingly, after they have been in college for a few years, more become "Liberals" than ever before, while the number designating themselves as "Conservative" is the smallest ever. At many schools there are only a third as many "Conservative" students as there were a decade ago. And the number calling themselves "radicals" has mushroomed six hundred percent.

Today's students have been conditioned to be *tolerant* of Communism. According to a recent poll a strong majority of sixty-two percent favor "co-existence" as the goal of American foreign policy. Nearly one in four advocates "unilateral disarmament" as a national goal. Only a lonely twelve percent would bar agents of the Communist Party from teaching in colleges and universities, something four times that many were opposed to only a decade ago. And "unilateral suspension of atomic weapons development" was endorsed by seventy percent of college students polled, compared with a slim twenty-six percent in 1960. Some forty-one percent maintain that, "nation-states being dangerously anachronistic," the United States should "surrender some of her sovereignty in a

serious attempt at achieving... world government."

This softening of the will of American youth to preserve even our national independence is most evident when it comes to questions about what they would favor if *push* ever comes to *shove* in our dealings with the Communists. Polls indicate that the slogan "Better Red than dead" is now one with which a majority of collegians agree. If "all other alternatives were closed save a world war with the Soviet Union or surrender to the Soviet Union," fifty-four percent would prefer surrender, while only thirty-seven percent say they would choose to defend their country.

A survey taken between 1961 and 1963 showed that about half of the graduating collegians had moved Leftward while touring the Halls of Ivy, but nearly twenty-five percent had moved to the Right. Recently, however, an incredible seventy-seven percent of the students polled admitted that their political attitudes had shifted Leftward since they entered college. Only nine percent said they had moved to the Right, and this includes those who shifted from Maoism to McGovernism — a fairly short jaunt.

One of those students who survived the Left's ideological blitz is Lynda Morstadt. She described the experience in the *Chicago Tribune* of June 15, 1968:

Recently I completed four years of college at North Central College as a political science major. Day after day I was told by one professor of the evils of capitalism, the horrors of United States foreign policy, and the forthcoming fall of the American system of government.

I also was told of the greatness of the socialist and communist systems. One final exam question even asked us to tell why the United States should become a socialist nation or a welfare state. I

dared to argue with the beliefs of this professor and my grades were substantially lowered.

The last semester I served as editor of my college newspaper. My editorials usually favored our American government policies as well as those of our school administration. I also spoke against militant black power and rioting. Again, I saw my grades lowered by professors who disagreed with my editorial viewpoints.

Academic freedom is one thing. But professors who preach theories such as those of my ex-political science teacher are another. These are the same professors who are responsible for inciting students to riot and rebel. Involvement, concern, and commitment are one thing; violence, disrespect, and disobedience are another.

In the wake of Senator [Robert] Kennedy's death, people are asking how we can restore sanity and greatness to our nation. We can start on the college campus where students should be educated to show respect for our nation... they should not be taught "pro-Communist, anti-capitalist, and anti-United States" theories.

One must admit that it takes great courage for even the best students to resist pressures from radical professors who hold the grade book. In fact, there is abundant evidence that during the recent decade it was the faculties who were behind much of the campus violence. Their role was described as follows by a University of California professor of sociology, Robert Nisbet, in *U.S. News & World Report* for June 15, 1970:

Without faculty stimulus, financial contributions and other forms of assistance, the student revolt could never really have got off the

ground. Not, obviously, all of the faculty.... But it was... a powerful minority.... Most... served the student revolutionists well. Granted that they only rarely ventured forth into the open, and that under the iron security of academic tenure they had nothing whatever to fear from administration and regents, their role in the revolution was a vital one.

Dr. S.I. Hayakawa of San Francisco State agrees, noting: "The worst enemies of American higher education are professors, or a minority of professors within it. They've got an awful lot of routine undergraduate teaching to do, and they are bored stiff. The only way they can get a little excitement... is to appeal to their students for admiration, and they appeal therefore to the most radical and most immature of their students."

That the academic ship of fools continues to list drastically to port is a fact that not even the Leftists who are doing the leaning find it necessary to deny. As one of the most noted of "Liberal" sociologists, Harvard's Seymour Lipset, has recently observed: "Intellectuals, academics... in the United States tend as a group to be disproportionately on the left. They are either liberal Democrats or supporters of left-wing minor parties." That is a fact with which Professor John East is all too familiar. A Conservative professor of political science, he is a member of a *real* minority group. In the *Wall Street Journal* of July 2, 1970, Professor East outlined the problem:

One is still plagued, however, with the nagging question of why liberal dominance is so utterly disproportionate in academe compared with American thought and life in general.... Indeed, a broadly defined conservatism may well be the dominant theme of American life. Certainly it is clear that the

liberal-left professoriate is hardly representative of "mainstream" America. Why is the imbalance so great and so pronounced?

To begin with, the graduate schools, which train our future faculties, are overwhelmingly liberal and they attract and reproduce their own kind. This vicious circle is difficult to break. At best the graduate school environment for the conservative is usually a neutral one, and sometimes it can be hostile. Too often liberal academe equates liberalism with intelligence, and conservatism with lack of same. The end result is to discourage conservative students from entering graduate work in such crucial disciplines as political science and history where this formula is more likely to be honored.

Professor East is concerned that the Left is strongest in those subjects which deal most directly with politics. As he puts it:

In those academic disciplines where the discussion of politics is central, political science and history, the liberal-left dominance is greater than it is in the whole of academe. In my discipline of political science, and to a lesser extent it is true of history departments, conservatism, either of traditional or libertarian strains, is represented by an exceedingly small group of professors.

Liberal dominance of the faculties means a shutting out of conservative thought and ideas. Students are likely to know who Arthur Schlesinger Jr. and John Kenneth Galbraith are, and they are almost certain to know of Che, Fidel, Ho, Malcolm X, Goodman, Sartre, Cleaver and Marcuse. Their teachers have prepared them well.

On the other hand ask them about Kirk, Burnham, Voegelin, Strauss, Hazlitt, Tonsar, Molnar, Herberg, Possony, Kintner or any figure affiliated with contemporary conservative thought, and the likelihood is great they will have never heard of them. At best they may know of Buckley (who doesn't?), but the image they will have of him is usually unfavorable.

It is hardly surprising that "Liberal" faculties produce "Liberal" students. Unfortunately, there is evidence that some leading "Conservatives" no longer feel the struggle on the campus to be worth the effort. Even Russell Kirk has recently written that "wild horses couldn't drag me back to permanent residence on the typical campus." Similarly, prior to his election to Congress, Professor Philip M. Crane wrote:

If there were a genuine hope of reforming the university from within, conservative professors could take the lack of promotions, minimal pay raises, cramped offices, paper work, committee overloads, suppression in the journals, prejudice in the reviews, as a small price to pay to achieve the restoration of the academy. But the prospect of internal reform appears remote.

It certainly does! Success of the campaign to make every phase of university life "relevant" to collectivist purposes is now almost total. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "the largest survey of academic opinion ever made," found that ninety-one percent of the professors surveyed think courses should be — you guessed it — "more relevant." No less a "Liberal" than Professor Jacques Barzun of Columbia University admits that the current cry for relevance means nothing but dealing with political questions and reducing classes to "Liber-

al" seminars in current events. And, Barzun admits that the cry by students for "relevance" is only a parroting of what they have been told in the classroom.

Some of the "relevant" courses that the young radicals and their tutors have designed are real lulus. Courses in astrology and witchcraft, for instance, are considered very "relevant" on campus these days. If you're interested, you might drop in at Fordham University and audit its course in "Devilology." Fordham's Reverend Robert McNally says, "Thirty-six students are enrolled, and I could have found twice as many who wanted to take the course. It deals with various aspects of the occult — witchcraft, demons, demonic possession and devil worship."

If you want a little different slant on the subject you might journey up to Brandeis for Sociology 157b, "Studies in the History of Witchcraft." The senior shaman for that course was originally scheduled to teach Negro History, but apparently that was last year's fad. Brandeis also offers Sociology 148a, a course in "Social Psychology of Consciousness." Mr. Rosenberg, who specializes in this new social science, describes Sociology 148a in the catalogue as follows:

The course will be organized around the concept of "conscious energy" as revealed in some of the many programs designed to awaken higher levels of consciousness (e.g., Zen, Yoga, Sufism, psychedelic drugs, and the teachings of F.I. Gurdjieff). The course will include a workshop in Hatha Yoga.

In Sociology 148b, if you are following me, Mr. Rosenberg guides "an exploration of ethnographic, historical and literary descriptions, as well as psychiatric research concerned with the uses of hallucinogenic drugs."

Oh, there are all sorts of "relevant" courses. And "relevant" majors too. Isaac

Bonewits, for example, will soon receive a B.A. in Magic from the University of California, Berkeley. "Magic is like medicine," student wizard Bonewits explains. "It is both an art and a science. I'm not studying it as something dead and historical. I'm studying it as something that has been very badly confused and mixed up over the years but still has application today." Though he is now only a sorcerer's apprentice, Bonewits plans eventually to become a Ph.D. Magician.

Such madness is epidemic. The University of California at Davis was far from unique when it offered credit for participating in "peace marches" as part of an anthropology course designed "to explore and to understand nonviolent influence and pacifism." But the school at Davis was the first bastion of higher learning to offer a course which boasted shoplifting as a class project. Digging deep into "prejudice," psychology instructor David Lopes reported that he wore a suit and tie, carried a briefcase, "and took everything I wanted without being challenged." But other members of the class, wearing hippie-type clothing, "came under a lot of suspicion."

An interesting ecology course is Survival 494 at the University of Hawaii. To get a passing grade in that one a student must attend classes all semester without using a car. As you might imagine, courses in ecology, "Liberal" style, are very, very "relevant" this year.

"Religion" is also reported to be "relevant" once again. Undoubtedly many parents of Princeton students are relieved to learn that their offspring have signed up for Religion 209, conducted by one Myron S. McClellan. Being "relevant," it is not taught in a stuffy old classroom, but meets in the basement of the Princeton Inn. Students report that the class engages in group pot-smoking and obscene chanting to rock music. How "relevant" can you get? When this course was first offered in 1970, 220 Princeton scholars signed up for it.

In an attempt to be "super-relevant," schools are now setting up experimental universities within the university. Typical is Kresge College, recently established at the University of California, Santa Cruz. A report in the *Los Angeles Times* of March 21, 1971, reveals:

The emphasis will be on environmental studies and the approach will include encounter groups and sensitivity training, but beyond that little has been decided, nor is it likely to be until the students and faculty arrive.

Kresge College should be what its students and professors want it to be [Provost Robert] Edgar believes. "Most things fail because people are following 'ought to's,' rather than 'want to's,'" he said.

The University of California at La Jolla has decided to name a part of its campus Lumumba-Zapata University, after a Congolese Communist and a turn-of-the-century Mexican bandit. Lumumba-Zapata specializes in racism — the kind the "Liberals" approve. It caters to "third world" ideology, which means Marxism tailored for Blacks and Chicanos.

Sometimes, however, no matter how much money they spend, the educational bureaucrats even disgust one another. Take heart from the report of Jay Neugeboren, a young revolutionary who told his story in *Esquire*:

In the Spring of 1968... I accepted a teaching position at a new "experimental" college on Long Island — the State University of New York's College at Old Westbury. ... my disappointment with the school was immediate and immense.... With only eighty-three students, I discovered, the college was already a full-scale bureaucracy. There were, by count, more full-time administrators (fourteen)

than faculty (eleven), and the total support staff — secretaries seemed to be everywhere — numbered more than sixty. I received three or four memos a day — reports, studies, notices for committee meetings, evaluations of reports; in the president's office there were shelves lined with more than seventy different handouts, mostly reprints of his own speeches about the college. (I saved all the memos and reports I received; at the end of my thirteen months at the college I brought them home; they weighed thirty-four pounds — i.e., about three pounds per month.)

... What never ceased to amaze me was the funds that were being poured into the college for buildings, supplies, consultants, printing, secretaries, cars.... For its two dozen faculty and administrators, there were five state cars; when the school grew to two hundred twenty-two students — and a staff of more than a hundred — in the Fall of 1969, five additional cars were ordered....

The school's operating budget was slightly over one million dollars for the first year, slightly under two million for the second (items such as the cars came out of a separate budget in Albany).

... The advance construction budget... for building a school that would have five thousand students when completed, was (and the figure will doubtless double by the time construction is finished in the late Seventies) one hundred million dollars. As before in my life, I began generalizing: if such waste and wealth were running wild at one college in America....

Poor Jay! He quit his teaching position in disillusionment without awarding a single B.A. in Revolution.

At most such schools there is no attempt even to disguise the revolutionary nature of the courses. Here are some samples from the 1970 catalogue of the University of California's Center for Participatory Education:

"Repression and the Movement, 1-5 units, Crim. 198, grade or P/NP. There are forty undercover pigs on the Berkeley campus. This course is designed to find out why Berkeley is no different from the rest of the U.S., why the Black Panthers have been systematically murdered, jailed, and exiled, and why Judge Julius Hoffman and the Chicago 8 is no mistake, but part of a conscious program of police repression and the growth of a 'liberal' police state. We will publish leaflets and pamphlets, sponsor rallies, photograph and reveal undercover pigs, and anything else we can search our minds for. The course *shall* be completely run and controlled by those of us who participate. Time and place to be arranged. * * *

"The New American Revolution. This course is about understanding the necessity and possibility of an American revolution. This course will be organized around three broad areas: 1. Understanding the System: American imperialism and monopoly capitalism, militarism, racism, and colonialism, who rules America, Soviet Union and revisionism, repression and fascism, technological revolution. 2. The Revolutionary Forces: Third World Liberation movements, China, Vietnam, Cuba, Black and Third World movements, inside U.S., youth and the new left, women, industrial working class. 3. The Duty of the Revolution is to Make the Revolution: strategy, organization and tactics, new left organizing, revolutionary attitudes . . . Lectures will be given by several, including David Horowitz, editor of Ramparts, Hal Jacobs and Tom Hayden (SDS). Small discussion groups will meet once a week. The course was organized by International Liberation School. * * *

"Revolutionary First Aid. Credit pend-

ing. A first aid course with emphasis on drug education, crisis and abuse-riot, medical dynamics — auto and fire accidents — burns — transportation of the sick and injured — clubbing injuries — poisons, chemicals and gases (tear gas, mace, etc.). Specific ways to set up block and community first aid stations and people's free clinics. * * *

"Getting in Touch. Credit pending. Using nonverbal communication techniques, touch-trust-intimacy games, we will explore what it means to be 'persons together.' Class limited to 10 men and 10 women. * * *

"Urban Awareness. Credit pending. Required for class: a weekend experience (Feb. 20-22) in the city. Live in an experimental commune. Includes presentation of National Sex and Drug Forum, meeting with members and directors of Hospital House for runaways. Council on Religion and the Homosexual, Mission Rebels, Red Guard of Chinatown, Panthers. The experience is coordinated through Glide Memorial in S.F. and will cost \$15/ participant. * * *

"Contemporary Soviet Civilization. This course is designed for the students who wish to function as informed citizens, rather than experts or teachers, on the U.S.S.R. The course will be conducted, as far as possible, in the form of a dialogue: questions from students and instructors for the purpose of stimulating discussion. Audio-visual aids will be extensively used, documentary films and, particularly, translations of tapes of unstructured conversations between Mr. William Mandel and Soviet citizens randomly encountered during his last (fourth) visit to the U.S.S.R.

"A term paper will be required, but no final; a mid-term will be given to establish that the basic knowledge required for intelligent pursuit of the course has been acquired. Instructor: William Mandell [*a member of the Communist Party*]. * * *

"Imperialism and Revolution. The Bolshevik Marxists had a coherent theory of

imperialism and revolution which was dramatically, but only partially, confirmed in the revolution in backward Russia in 1917. Since the triumph of the Bolsheviks, there has been no adequate attempt to synthesize a theory of subsequent global developments within a coherent Marxist framework. This course will attempt to synthesize such a theory. No previous knowledge of Marxism is required for the course, and every attempt will be made to give the fullest discussion to what is admittedly a very wide range of subjects. Students interested in the course are urged to read the following at their earliest convenience: Baran, *The Political Economy Of Growth*; Deutscher, *The Unfinished Revolution*; Williams, *The Tragedy Of American Diplomacy*."

The above courses in Communist Revolution, to repeat, are all funded by the taxpayers of California, Governor Ronald Reagan presiding. No doubt "Liberal" state universities elsewhere are doing even "better."

One of the chief criteria for a class to be "relevant" is that there must be no grading. You see, grades are a bourgeois affectation based upon the archaic tenets of competition, sometimes known as the "Protestant ethic." The initial step toward abolishing grades was to put courses on a "pass-fail" basis. Next, even such prestigious universities as Yale eliminated F grades, and Stanford has gone so far as to eliminate Ds. It is thus impossible to flunk out of school, a circumstance no doubt cheered by tavern owners in the vicinity of the campus.

Advocates of this system maintain that one should study for the sheer love of learning and not to earn a "meaningless" grade. Turn back the clock to those glorious days of yesteryear when you were a student. It is eleven p.m. and you have a mid-term at eight a.m. in Organic Chemistry. You have a choice between going out on a late date or putting in another three hours with the books. If

there were no grades, what would you have done?

Then there is the matter of drugs. For several years most Americans have been aware of the drug problem on college campuses. Until recently, drugs had been a phenomenon of the fringes and freakies. No more. United Press International quotes a high official of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics as maintaining that professors have been encouraging the use of drugs among students. "In some cases, junior members of the faculty are responsible for some of the experimentation. They're the younger members who are overcome with their own theoretical approaches to things," says the official. *Time* of January 4, 1971, reports of the campus: "Pot smoking is almost universal." *U.S. News & World Report* for June 19, 1972, says that "Marijuana is by far the most popular drug among college students of both sexes, and its use seems to be taken for granted." Students at many schools, says the Washington-based magazine, report that marijuana is "everywhere" and that at many institutions more than half the students smoke the drug regularly. A recent survey reported that seventy percent of college students favor legalization of marijuana.

The major dangers of all of this are summarized by Dr. Hardin Jones, Professor of Medical Physics and Physiology at the University of California:

For 20 years I have studied the effects of drug use and aging. Marijuana ages the nervous system in somewhat the same way as Parkinson's Disease. The brain itself is impaired . . .

. . . It is easy to show that marijuana is many times more harmful than alcohol. Users progress faster to daily use - 10 times faster. . . . While most marijuana users have not as yet tried heroin, a large fraction have and one to two mil-

lion are now junkies. Only marijuana users progress to heroin... and the disastrous epidemic of new heroin addicts comes entirely from the ranks of pot smokers....

British scientists recently showed that daily use of marijuana causes brain atrophy in three to ten years....

A major factor in the spread of the drug epidemic has been that most schools have dropped the practice of administering *in loco parentis*, a system whereby the school acts as a parent. Martin Gross writes of the abandonment by colleges of *in loco parentis* in the *Philadelphia Bulletin* for October 27, 1968:

No one old enough to have a nostalgic memory of either the corny college-life movies of the late 1930s, or the actual experience of attending college anytime before 1960, can truly believe the success that contemporary college students have had in thumbing their egos at the parent generation.

Youthful attempts at ingenious revolt are age-old, but this generation has one undebatable distinction: It is getting away with it.

The years of maturation are stormy as the female body fully forms and the boyish psyche seeks to assert its masculinity. The traditional beer and sex bashes, panty raids, and goldfish-eating of older days aroused some little concern, but most parents winked at such indiscretions because they knew that college authorities were on the job as substitute parents.

As the respected in loco parentis (in place of parents) figures, deans and college administrators protected and disciplined the youngsters, at least in the direst of pinches. The unseen but firm parent-college entente, plus the threat

of expulsion, was generally enough to keep the fiercest of young tigers in line.

But now the deans have decided that *in loco parentis* is as outmoded as Mah-Jongg. Modern students, so the theory goes, are much too sophisticated to require that sort of thing. And besides, say the deans, it is really not the place of the university to try to force a "value system" on the students — who must be left to themselves to delve at leisure into life's wallows, poisons, and perversions.

The first major university to abandon *in loco parentis* was, of course, the University of California, Berkeley. According to Professor Hardin Jones, when the school dropped the practice "the vacuum created was first used to bring about the use of drugs. Students were encouraged to use marijuana, LSD, and other drugs. It is a sad chapter in the history of academic institutions that this has happened." The University looked the other way, and the drug problem was soon out of hand. Then University officials used that as an excuse for continuing to look the other way. Now the line was that the use of illegal drugs was impossible to control.

What started at Cal has now spread to hundreds of other colleges and universities as the schools have gone loco in abandoning *in loco parentis*. The Bureau of Narcotics complains that not only do the colleges make no effort to control drug use, they actually hamper law enforcement when officers try to break up campus drug rings.

The latest, and possibly the most dangerous, drug to sweep the campuses is called methaqualone, purported by its pushers to have aphrodisiac qualities. It is a strong hallucinogen and more addictive than heroin. Problems associated with its withdrawal are severe. Victims turn blue and breathe slowly and shallowly, and doctors have often had to administer oxygen for twenty-four hours through a

trachea tube in order to revive them. Japan has sold the drug since the Fifties, and reports indicate that about half the drug addicts in hospitals there from 1963 to 1967 were hooked on methaqualone.

Methaqualone may be abetting the sexual revolution on campus, but it certainly didn't start it. Back of every revolution is a philosophy, or pseudo-philosophy. Behind the sexual revolution is the "New Morality." Professor Joseph Fletcher, considered the father of the "New Morality" or "Situation Ethics," sums up the philosophy in these words: "For me there are no rules, none at all." According to Fletcher, "anything and everything is right or wrong according to the situation. What is wrong in some cases would be right in others." In other words, if you can find a half-way plausible rationalization for something, go ahead and do it. "And this candid approach," he proclaims, "is indeed a revolution in morals." Professor Fletcher's pseudo-philosophy has found a welcome home in thousands of college classrooms and dormitories.

With the teachers preaching the "New Morality" and the administrations abandoning *in loco parentis*, the results were as predictable as sunrise. Now the colleges are openly promoting sexual immorality by freeing students of the consequences of promiscuity. The *New York Times* for January 1, 1972, summarizes:

At Yale, as at dozens of other colleges around the country, much of the innovation in student health care has come in sex-related areas to meet needs created by changes in student life styles

Yale, like many other large universities, has for several years been supplying students with the "morning-after" pill for emergency contraception, as well as with a wide variety of more conventional birth control aids. This fall Yale added vasectomies to its list of available options

At the University of California, Berkeley, the contraceptive clinic that opened two years ago is visited by 4,000 to 6,000 students a year. The University of Nebraska handles 50 to 60 contraceptive cases each week, even with a charge of \$15.00 each.

The *Times* adds that the University of Michigan maintains a separate gynecology clinic, as do most other large universities. As Boston University's director of student health services explained: "It was done in recognition of changing times — if you start having dorms wide open, it adds to problems along gynecological lines." Barnard's health director, Dr. Harriett Mogul, says her service offers birth control and abortion referrals because "we would rather have the information dispensed here where we are sure of its accuracy, than have our students search on their own There has been surprisingly little parental opposition to decisions like Barnard's." The *New York Times* reports that when the sex program at the University of California, Los Angeles, was described to parents of freshmen, it received favorable reaction. "It adds that most universities now offer pregnancy testing without charge.

Not only is the pill available on request from most college health centers, but a number of state schools are even distributing them to freshman women at the time of their incoming physical. The pills are dispensed automatically . . . to everyone. Which certainly amounts to encouraging promiscuity at the expense of both parents and taxpayers.

Of course, there is always some careless soul who, forgetting to take the pill, is faced with the consequences of doing her own thing. College newspapers carry advertisements for abortions, but in many cases this is not necessary. According to Governor Ronald Reagan, the University of California at San Diego performs an average of ten abortions per week. The

Governor reported on September 9, 1970, that the "abortion counseling service" on the San Diego campus "helped" 718 girls in a six-month period to obtain abortions. As Governor Reagan noted: "Operations that cost an average of \$400 are made at the expense of the taxpayers to say nothing of the moral issue involved."* Although figures for other schools are not available, there is little reason to believe that the situation in California is in any way unique. The friendly folk at the University of Maine, for instance, have the dishonor to be the first to have established an abortion loan fund!

After providing the co-ed with birth-control pills and assurance of the availability of abortion, most of the state schools now look the other way as the girls move in with their boyfriends. Writing in the *Camden Courier-Post*, M.J. Wilson reports:

... as the fall semester begins at colleges all over the country, it is increasingly clear that coeducation has become almost synonymous with cohabitation.

It is impossible to estimate how many couples are living together. The number varies radically from campus to campus, and most administrations don't take the trouble to keep count.

At the University of Minnesota, for instance, more than two-thirds of the 40,000 students live off-campus, and many don't bother to list addresses with the college. At the University of California at Berkeley, a conservative guess is that 1,000 couples share living quarters — but not marriage licenses.

The sexual revolution has moved on campus with explosive force, and most colleges have chosen to capitulate rather than fight.

"The average freshman here now is more experienced and sophisticated than the graduating student of 20 years ago," says Jim Lemmon, Dean of Men at Berkeley. "There is just no way we can stop those who freely decide to cohabit off campus." That attitude is typical. At the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, the Dean of Women announced that the University had dropped the rule against female students spending the night in the apartments of single males. Students ought to be "free to develop their own sense of values," said Dean Alice Emerson.

In some cases, a boy and girl lease an apartment as roommates, with the girl signing only the first initial of her given name. In others, the boy takes an apartment, and the girl (depending on the rules at her college) either signs out to a fictitious address or else puts the boy's name and address on the sign-out sheet. The *Camden Courier-Post* elaborates:

There is usually an awkward period of adjustment for the couples. A Harvard Business School student, a veteran of several cohabitations, offers the following guidelines:

"When you can walk around naked in the apartment, that's the first step. When you begin referring to it as 'our place,' that's the next step. When your parents have heard her voice on the phone enough times to begin calling her by her first name instead of 'that girl,' you've got it made."

Parents can pose serious problems. As a result, some couples take the precaution of installing separate phones and neither partner ever answers the other's.

One Oberlin College student remembers a time when his mother found a pair of girl's slippers under his bed. "She wasn't sure," he

*The Governor used this as a campaign issue, but has done nothing to stop it.

remembers, "whether I was a homosexual or secretly married."

From coast to coast the rage on campus is now co-ed living in the dormitories! There is an old saying that familiarity breeds contempt. With the destruction of *in loco parentis*, this theme is getting a real test. Writing in the *Philadelphia Bulletin*, Martin Gross notes that at Stanford: "Young men and women are housed together on campus in the same dormitory, if not the same room. If only Sigmund Freud had lived to learn that his unscientific warning of sexually repressed neurosis had made him a cherished patriarch to the ever-prowling college male!"

The abandonment of strict regulations even when the students are housed formally in separate dormitories is indicated by an official at California's prestigious Pomona College, where open-house hours are maintained. "As long as you do it during open-house hours," he says, "there's no rule against intercourse on campus." During one whole school year, a co-ed at California's new Pitzer College spent just nine nights in her own room; the rest of the time she was sleeping in her boyfriend's dormitory room at nearby Pomona. "I had to whisper all the time," she recalls.

The *alma mater* has simply become a madam!

Many of us fogies, young and old, recall when it was a virtual hanging offense for a girl to be in the bedroom area of a boys' dormitory, or vice versa. If you didn't get a case of rope-burn, you were at least expelled from school. Now, the administration puts boys and girls in co-ed dorms, provides them with contraceptives, winks, and looks the other way. Of course, students try to deny that having male and female students living together on the same hall, in the same dorm, is in the least libidinous. *Esquire* for September 1972 puts it this way in an article entitled "The Free Love Blahs":

From the outside, co-ed dorms may look like an opportunity for instant sex, but to the practical eye of the student who must live there for months at a time they look a good deal different. For one thing, fraternal horseplay and sisterly hen sessions must sometimes yield to the necessity of dealing with the opposite sex as human beings, and as neighbors. In certain co-ed dormitories at Radcliffe, where rooms are situated along corridors as in a hospital and everybody of necessity knows everybody else's business, sexual liaison between residents is looked upon with the same enthusiasm as incest.

Unless that is a translation of an ancient screed by Oedipus Rex, it is easily the most absurd declaration since the oceanic command of King Canute. We think an editorial which appeared in the *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, when Stanford first allowed a fraternity to go co-ed, makes far more sense. Consider:

Call us old-fashioned, if you will, but we have strong reservations about the novel living arrangements now in effect at the Lambda Nu fraternity of Stanford University. There, unchaperoned and with no visiting rules, 32 college men and 23 women are studying, eating and sleeping in the same house.

This cozy set-up has the experimental approval of the university — and no doubt its officials deserve credit for their lack of stuffiness. What is to be pondered is their lack of common sense.

Ever since Adam and Eve, men have been men and women have been women — more or less — and human nature hasn't changed much. Yet a spokesman for Lambda Nu insists that "We have mostly a brother-sister relationship." Maybe

this is said with tongue in cheek. Maybe it doesn't make any real difference one way or the other in this brave new world. We were, however, impressed by the co-ed who said: "I'm finding out things about guys I never knew before."

That we believe!

Given the radicalism of college faculties and the abandonment by administrations of *in loco parentis*, Martin Gross believes that most college catalogues should begin with the following candid *caveat emptor* to parents:

At this university, we take no responsibility for your children, who are permitted full and imaginative license. In fact, it is common practice for young ladies to [sleep] with male students, or even with nonstudent drifters who are known to hang around our campus. Our faculty members, too, find co-bed companionship a stimulus to the academic environment.

Our chaplains, counselors, and psychologists are not interested in the traditional moral life of your children, and will make no attempt to dissuade them from the use of drugs, or from any other kind of debilitating habits. We find that a lot of kids like marijuana and LSD, and that their usage adds an edge to campus life that keeps our spirits and enrollments up.

Many of our faculty see eye-to-eye with our most rebellious students and will forcefully stop any attempt to inflict medieval concepts of law and order on this campus. They enjoy mixing with the youngsters, at pot parties and at our regular demonstrations.

Further, we take no responsibility if your child is injured during student protests, or if your daughter is sufficiently negligent to be-

come pregnant. We provide clinical advice on the use of pills, but abortion services are not included in our student hospitalization plan.

If you are concerned that your child will be victimized by the wide-open anarchistic scene that we run at this university, we suggest you enroll your girl in a nunnery, or have your boy join the U.S. Marines. Yours in "non loco parentis," The Dean.

The only thing Conservative parents of children who will attend such a college can do is to understand what the situation is and make the best possible effort to prepare their children to *survive* four years of such higher education.

After consulting with others who have experience in this dilemma, we offer the following suggestions for Conservative parents:

1. Religious training and sound moral instruction in the home are the best foundation for building a strong character. Make reverence and decency a part of your family life and you make them a part of your family. Your pastor can help, but the real job is up to you. The new Family Heritage Series, through which families gather weekly in their own homes to discuss moral and political problems with the use of a prepared study guide, provides an excellent way for Conservatives to approach this problem with their children.*

2. One of the best things a parent of maturing children can do is to get them active in the Conservative movement while they are in junior or senior high school. Such a young person will then have the background necessary to understand the fallacies of socialism and should enter college with a commitment to fight the Left rather than compromise his

*The Family Heritage Series is available at twenty dollars per year from The Movement To Restore Decency, 395 Concord Avenue, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178.

commitment to God, family, and country. I especially recommend the Youth Chapters of The John Birch Society and the Society's summer youth camps.

3. Young people should be prepared both educationally and psychologically for what they will be faced with when they are away at school. They should be thoroughly familiar with Fabianism and its techniques and should understand why pseudo-intellectuals are attracted to Marxism. Don't wait until it is too late to begin communicating these ideas to your children. Prepare them or don't send them.

4. Try to select a school which still maintains a policy of *in loco parentis*. And try to choose one which has at least one Conservative professor in the department in which your youngster wants to take his major. One good professor can provide the stability your son or daughter might need to weather the courses of Leftist instructors.

5. Be aware of the fantastic pressures put on your children by their school, friends, teachers, and the so-called "youth culture." No previous generation has ever suffered such pressures. While our young people now have unparalleled material advantages, they also have unparalleled psychological pressures. Don't fall into the Alienation Trap.

6. Avoid the Stereotype Trap. Don't dismiss genuine (if misguided) idealism as being Communist or un-American. Archie Bunker may be funny, but he doesn't do much to win the minds and hearts of the young. You must be able to show that the real idealists and humanitarians are on our side. A related matter is not to

dismiss immediately "Liberal" arguments that your children bring home from school. This is the time for light, not heat. Dogmatic, rigid declarations made with emotion but not backed up by reason and facts will only convince your children that you are dogmatic and rigid. You can't cover up for not doing *your* homework by trying to out-shout your youngsters.

7. Don't appear to be too quick to judge or use labels. Take time to think, explain, and teach. Keep in mind that "youth has no memory." A nineteen-year-old has been conscious of national events for five years at the most. He has no perspective. To him, World War II is ancient history, almost in a class with the Peloponnesian Wars. He wasn't even born when the Communists were enslaving Eastern Europe and China. What he hears about Communism he hears from "Liberals." You can't give him your conclusions without providing him with the background to understand those conclusions.

8. If worse comes to worst, you must be willing to bite the bullet. If you have not done a good job of preparing your child, and he joins the other side, *take him out of school!* The only thing that will save him at this point is a dose of reality therapy in the world of nine to five. And, there is no sense kidding ourselves, even that might not work. Your children, like those of so many others, could wind up cultivating a marijuana patch in a commune somewhere. Any parent to whom *that* has happened will be delighted to assure you that an ounce of prevention is worth a kilo of cure. ■ ■

CRACKER BARREL

■ Profit is to a business what a sparkplug is to a gasoline engine. Remove the sparkplugs and the best motor won't run. Remove the profits from a business and it, too, dies.

■ You have heard of the performer who claimed to have crossed the Grand Canyon riding a bicycle on a tightwire while keeping nine bulls, a lawn mower, and a wheel barrow in the air. Well, in comparison with the modern businessman harassed by O.S.H.A., that performer had the best of it. At least no one was working on the tight-wire with a hacksaw!