gues for a fantasy. He admits vouchers affect “less than 1 per cent of the school-age population.” Worse, he admits “...school choice already exists for those who have the resources...to live in the suburbs that offer better schools. The affluent already have the options they need.” Still worse, he accentuates the fantasy by idealizing schools “...financed by local donors and major foundations...” We should all be so lucky! Last, but not least, he anticipates a day when local schools will neither be subject to federal guidelines (apparently because they are “private”) nor assisted by public finance and expertise bearing on the matter at hand, he has reopened a decision. That would seem to be a salutary way of modeling academic conduct, even if doing so comes at a real cost.

Hindsight, of course, is cheap. But one wonders about opportunities for productive do-overs in the Crimson context.

In the three-plus years that the Harvard Corporation and advocates of divesting endowment investments in fossil-fuel producers have crossed swords, the economics of oil and natural-gas production have been transformed by falling prices; solar cells have plunged in cost—but now compete with cheaper fossil fuels; and MIT, which also declined to divest, has promulgated a research agenda on energy and climate change (see “A Modest Proposal,” January-February, page 4). As the world has changed, the arguments for each position have simply been repeated, without visibly advancing a Harvard clean-fuel agenda; and the community remains no more notably enlightened or engaged in what this University is and ought to be doing. Might a different course yield something better than more intellectual dry holes?

Or consider the College’s decision, announced during exams last May, to impose sanctions on members of single-gender social organizations—prominently including the final clubs. It became apparent that the policy may impose collateral damage: to newer organizations serving undergraduate women and, more broadly, to the principle of free association (see harvardmag.com/free-association-16). As at Yale, the issue may prompt broader discussion in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in the form of a debate on aspects of academic freedom: far from the issue the sanctions sought to address. How that debate unfolds may depend on whether the air is cleared first.

~John S. Rosenberg, Editor

P.S. We thank the many readers whose direct support enables us to publish this magazine—see the current list beginning on page 86—and we would, of course, welcome you to join them. ~J.S.R.