

Letters To The Editor

Blacks Betrayed

We, the undersigned core city scholarships recipients, protest vehemently the termination of the bi-monthly stipends promised to us as a condition of attending the University of Hartford.

When we returned from Christmas vacation we were informed by the Bursar, that the stipends had been temporarily terminated because of continued errors on behalf of member(s) of his staff. He stated to us that the increase in the checks resulting from compensatory payment because of tardiness in sending out the first two checks had never been changed and therefore the stipends would have to be temporarily terminated. Apparently, the top administration was aware of the problem but did not take the time to notify us.

Not only does the administration expect us to survive as students on no funds at all until March 1 but to accept undue hardship caused by the mistakes of others. As Black students, we feel that Black people in general have suffered long enough for the mistakes and misdeeds of others, "Others" being white racists. Inherent in this move by the administration is a crystal clear act of racism. This act has offended us immeasurably.

To avoid further frustration on our behalf, an apology and reinstatement of our promised stipends are definitely in order.

Walter Rapp Bailey
Milford Woodard, III
Sir Jake E. Newman, I
Morris Jackson

Cynthia Ann Redden
Sharon Ann Bingham
Mary Elizabeth Carr
Stephanie Ann Payne

Capitalism

To The Editor:

In response to the article by Dr. Armantano on "Capitalism"

One reason, possibly, for a student publication's "anti-capitalism" is that "anti-capitalist," "socialist," "communist," have been made, by adults, into "four letter words" instead of names for headings of rational discourse. As a result they have considerable value as irritants to copy-book economists.

Definitions should serve the purpose of distinguishing the thing defined from other things. A "good-guy" definition of capitalism as a system of "private enterprise," "competitive market," and "private ownership," hardly distinguishes it from other systems. The world has seen numerous economies in which individuals could engage in enterprise (as far back as ancient Sumer), hold property, and make decisions about the allocations of resources guided by the activities of the market. The world has also witnessed a variety of economic systems in which a relatively small group accumulated and used wealth and allocated resources, while a larger group accumulated poverty, misery, and ignorance. Moreover, all civilizations have had a certain proportion of people in the middle, with reference to the distribution of available goods and services.

A useful definition of "capitalism" ought to distinguish it from other systems in such a way as to help account for the significant changes that came over man's way of living in the western world not so very long ago. For instance, the new accumulators of wealth and allocators of resources came to be predominantly people who owned money and factories rather than people who owned land.

In contrast to earlier forms assumed by accumulated wealth, the new form was dynamic. It certainly was more growth inducing than the accumulation of stones in pyramids or jewels in storehouses. The dynamic impact of this system had certain effects: Industrialization, the advance of science, the growth of "democratic" forms of government. It is common to assume that mankind is better off as a result.

Perhaps, however, under the system as it has developed, the rich are richer than ever before. Yet there are no firm statistics on this. The Pharaohs of Egypt, the princes of India, the Emperors of Rome, were enormously rich. But the assumption that the poor are fewer or less worse off today also lacks statistical support. The even more enthusiastically proclaimed growth of the "middle classes" cannot be proven, it might as easily be maintained that the proportion of poor and middle and rich has remained fairly constant. All systems have had times of beginning and growth, times of best functioning, and times of worst functioning, sometimes followed by the appearance of a new system. It is possible that the proportion of poor goes down at times of best functioning, and rises at times of poorest function, about to the same extent in all societies so far.

It is possible that our system has been through its time of beginning, has had its time of best functioning, and is now going into its time of worst functioning. Certain interesting parallels exist between our times and the time of poorest functioning in ancient Rome, Medieval Europe, Czarist

Russia. This is not a proof of anything, but it is enough to create suspicion.

The present dominant mode of ownership by corporations, which are private not public in the sense that they represent the motives and interest of the group, not the whole of society, results in the flow of significant wealth through corporation hands. This gives them the predominant control of the allocation of resources in our economy. This allocation is made in terms of the quest for profit, but also in terms of the growth and survival of the corporations. So dominant is the position of the corporations that "public" (government) allocation of resources frequently (not always) turns out to be in the corporate interest.

This system tends to bring about many absurdities in the allocation of human energies and resources, (anyone could make a list) They are not the amusing kind of absurdity, but tragic distortions of the human spirit. To criticize the capitalist system because it is thought to produce such results inescapably, is to assume, I suppose, that some form of public control over the allocation of resources would result in a people-centered economy rather than a profit-motivated one and in the elimination of the fault.

If some such understanding lies behind being "against capitalism," such an opinion represents a serious and justifiable point of view, not just a reckless use of words.

Lawrence Kerstetter
alumnus and teacher

Please put me on your mailing list

420 Salmon Brook St.
Granby, Conn., 06035

Tuition Increase

To Applicants for Admission to Hartt College of Music and their Parents:

It is an established fact that quality educational programs in music are extremely costly due to the required private applied study, performing organizations, and classes whose special nature requires a limitation in their size.

Costs in education and in the general economy are rising. In order that the music division of the University of Hartford, Hartt College of Music, may continue to maintain and continue to improve the high quality of its professional programs, it has been found necessary to increase the tuition by \$50.00 per semester (\$100.00 for the year).

Tuition for full-time undergraduate students will now be \$887.50 per semester (\$1,775.00 for the year) effective September, 1969. Comparable tuition rates are operative at similar professional colleges of music which are member institutions of the National Association of Schools of Music, accrediting agency in music.

We are grateful for the understanding and cooperation of parents and students which makes possible the Hartt program.

Moshe Paranov
President, Hartt College of Music
Vice-Chancellor for Performing Arts

Jenson

To the Editor:

I should like to declare my support of the position so ably defended by my colleagues of the Biology Department, Professors Simpson and Duff, in their letter of December 11 discussing the views of Professor Koch of the School of Education on the nature of a university.

Professors Simpson and Duff are quite right to stress the importance of research and writing to good teaching. We need to ask about a teacher not only the question, "Does he arouse the students' enthusiasm?" but also the question, "WHAT does he arouse their enthusiasm about?" Surely, as Professors Simpson and Duff argue, it must be something more than merely the effectiveness of the time he spends with them.

I should also like to suggest another point in which Professor Koch's conception of a university will not do. It is not true to say that the "ultimate goal" of a university is the teaching of students, pure and simple. To do so is to mistake a university for a college or an academy. It has long been recognized that a university has not one, but two goals. The first is to transmit learning to students. The second is to create and advance learning. A university is -- or ought to be -- not only a place where knowledge is passed on, but also a place where knowledge is born.

The human community needs both teaching and research, and the university is the place where BOTH happen. To suppose that we can DO without one or the other, or that we can HAVE one without the other is erroneous.

Gordon M. Jensen
Department of History

Wipo's Father

Dear Mr. Hardy;

Having had the opportunity to read several of your recent issues, I feel constrained to take pen in hand (an archaic expression meaning "I feel like writing") to give you the reaction of a left-wing campus journalist of the mid-30's.

As one gets older, one's memory becomes a bit hazy. Also, one tends to lie a little. Nevertheless I cannot help but feel that today's collegiate "bad boys" are pale and puny compared with the titans of our day.

To cite a single example: can you claim to have had your publi-

cation suspended by the university? Well, sir, not only were we suspended, but our doughty editor continued to publish as an off-campus organ!

I feel that your dismal failure to be suspended can be traced to the image you are projecting -- that of naughty kids who will soon grow up -- rather than to the inaction of a pusillanimous administration.

("Pusillanimous administration" -- here was a sure-fire epithet we invoked on every possible occasion. How feeble your half-dozen four-letter words sound, compared to our tried and true "pusillanimous administration".)

So you're having a bit of trouble with the law. Let me point out with pardonable pride that we managed to get ourselves and our university cited by an entire congressional committee!

Like yourself, we never lost an opportunity to extend our purview from the campus microcosm to world affairs, however contrived the linkage. "Scholarships," our placards proclaimed, "not battleships." In our infinite campus wisdom, we knew Hitler and Mussolini to be frauds, rattling paper-mache swords.

You may wonder what became of our doughty editor. Well, the ravages of time finally caught up with him, and he graduated. Forced at last to come to grips with the realities of life, the poor fellow became editor-in-chief of a large metropolitan newspaper. This did not prove to his liking, and when last heard from, he was the author of a moody, carping daily column in the same paper.

The one bit of advice I can offer is this: if you really want to get into big trouble, you'll have to work at it much harder. At this point, it is difficult to take too seriously what seems to be the innumerable efforts of a self-conscious poseur -- hardly in our revered tradition.

"Look, Ma," you seem to be saying, "I'm being bad."

So, buckle on your sword and try again; surely you don't want to pass on to the next generation an escutcheon bearing the symbols of a revolutionary Avis. And, above all, stop being so -- well -- pusillanimous!

Sincerely,
Ira Steiner
111 Tardy Lane
Wantagh, New York

Louie Speaks

Dear Jackson von Hardy, Esq.:

On Dec. 10, PFC Claude G. Schleuderer, U.S.M.C.R., joined in debate in Auerbach Auditorium with Jeffrey St. John, a New York publicist who could never sleep in the same bed with the late Madam Alexandra Kollontai, one-time Soviet ambassador to Sweden.

Subject of the debate, in which Prof. Darryl B. Baskin brought up the rear, was the democracy or the anti-democracy of the "New Left."

Private Schleuderer, as you know, is vice president of Owl and Gavel, UoffH debate society. The undersigned had NOT seen Mr. Schleuderer in action before, and was prepared to be disenchanted.

On the contrary: lucidly, eloquently, with nary a cussword or a snide personal reference, Dr. Schleuderer took on Mr. St. John, who is a polished pro and a gentleman besides, and (I thought) came off very well indeed.

Later, PFC Schleuderer and Mr. St. John repeated their verbal jousting on tape at WTIC/Channel 3, downtown. And at the end, they both shook hands again, with expressions of mutual regard.

So, although both orators are poles apart politically, at least they could establish a mutual dialogue, of sorts, and not spit in each other's eye. Bravo, and again, bravo! If Claude continues to maintain his cool, through graduate school and on into his profession, he should enjoy a topnotch career.

Incidentally, I have in my hand, as the late Senator Joseph Raymond McCarthy (Rep., Wisconsin) once said, the Dec. 1 issue of "The

Bulletin of Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council, Inc." -- IRAC.

Commenting on the thoughts of such professionals as Dr. Edward H. Levi, the new president of the University of Chicago; Dr. Jacques Barzun, former provost at Columbia; Admiral Hyman G. Rickover and Dr. Arthur Bestor, of the University of Illinois, IRAC declares: "Rickover and Dr. Bestor" have been urging teachers to spendless time on their own careers and more time doing what they are supposed to be doing. But the professional educationists ignore this advice. The pressure to "publish or perish" continues. Teaching is often regarded as a nuisance which graduate students have to perform in the course of obtaining their advanced degrees."

Pass-fail, anyone?

-- The Satyr of South Cottage

Registering

To Whom It SHOULD Concern:

This cram-registering to which all freshmen (and other assorted lowly creatures are subject) may be advantageous and convenient and groovy and all kinds of things like that for the Deans -- but it is pretty lousy where we are concerned. For example, when I went to register I inevitably had to "drop-add" some courses. I was authorized to take one of the courses from which I had previously been excluded. However, when I got to the registrar I was informed that (1) the authorization which was on MY copy was of little value, since they would have no proof I had been given permission (obviously they're all a bunch of liars and nobody takes THEIR word for anything either) and (2) even though the drop-adds were for the same courses (just different times) I had to have my advisor sign again (to show that my ability to choose courses for myself was of a high enough caliber to suit him; HIM, they TRUST!).

Fortunately for Mom's Apple Pie and I, a little more running around and another Prof of the same dept, as my advisor set things right with his signature and a little note on the same sheet attesting to the fact that I was authorized to take the course I wanted (remember lack in paragraph #1 -- permission to take the closed course, so the Office could trust the registrars, so that I could get the courses, etc., etc., etc.). But the fact remains that this whole thing was an unnecessary Bad Scene; even worse than when we at least had a few weeks to do what must be done. For the sake of the Big Office, registration is over and done with faster than ever -- great, fine, . . . BUT, not without practically forcing a good many of us to skip a lot of classes, needlessly. I say needlessly because there must be a better, more efficient way, even if you have to hand a drawing for who gets first preference in registering.

Gentlemen, if you give a damn, how about a break?

Sincerely,
Joe College
Middle-class of '72

Virgins

Dear Mr. Hardy,

I am a freshman and I am a virgin. I am afraid and I am confused. Maybe I'm really alone too -- so many people try to tell me that. They don't like my shell. Since I've been at college I've peeled away at least one coat of armor -- I guess that leaves me with "Hell."

I want one day to marry and raise a family. The best gift I thought I could bring to marriage was my virginity I'm not so sure anymore if that is even important. The dream that gave me so much security is shattered now. For the first time in my life I've had to make decisions and trust them, I've had to work with what

(Continued on page 6)