

Letters to the Editor

The Changing Concept of War

by Pete Cunningham

Ever since men developed civilizations, the entry of war has been a parasite upon the effectiveness and happiness of human cultures.

For many centuries the way war has been waged has changed slowly. Innovations and improvements were introduced and accepted. But the advances in warfare technology occurred slowly enough so that the existing cultures of the day were able to adjust and, comparatively speaking, accept the way war was fought.

Today, advances and changes are everywhere in peoples' styles of living. Technology has altered transportation, house-work, recreation, ... just about everything; even war.

It used to be that all warring nations employed their most modern weapons against each other. But no longer. Now wars are limited as to both weapons and strategy. Today, war is a mixture of the usage of strategy and weaponry of twenty years ago with the threat of today's reserve of nuclear missiles. Wars of attrition have replaced the San Juan Hill type of battle.

Thus, there is now the question of how much power to use when a conflict breaks out.

The United States has resorted to nuclear weapons at times. Presently she is fighting a stalemate war with the ways of pre-nuclear World War II.

Over a year ago, the U.S. intelligence ship *Pueblo* and crew were taken prisoner by North Korea while in international waters. Since their release, the commander of the *Pueblo*, Capt. Bucher, has been accused by Pentagon officials of having needlessly surrendered his ship without retaliating with the World War II machine guns on board. Bucher said that he surrendered in order to save the lives of his crew since they had fewer weapons than the attacking North Koreans.

There are seen by this example many questions never asked decades ago: Should the *Pueblo* have defended itself? If it had, would there have been a nuclear war involving the U.S.? Should the *Pueblo* have had up-to-date weapons? Was Bucher right?

What all of these thoughts point out in summation is that the culture of the modern United States has grown so idealistic and sophisticated that it abhors any fighting and killing that it deems unnecessary.

On the other hand, the U.S. Military Administration; e.g., the Pentagon in the *Pueblo* incident, is not bothered as much by fighting and killing as are most civilians.

Apparently Bucher was caught up somewhere in the middle of these two clashing schools of thought.

Basic Requirements

by bill clement

The first two years of any "liberal of arts" students' education is one of unnecessary frustrations. The student, it is assumed, will be programmed to be well versed in a variety of fields - therefore, being quite liberal. On the record, it sounds like a noble adventure; however, for the student forced to endure these "suicidal" courses, it is one of excessive frustrations, and unnecessary headaches. The student, prior to his acceptance at the University was forced to compete on a similar level by taking such courses as maths, sciences, languages, etc. In a college level, the student should be given the opportunity to widen his knowledge in those areas which will be not only beneficial to himself, but in those areas in which he has shown the greatest potential. Consider the plight of the poor student forced into the field of science, of which he has no interest having dissected frogs and earthworms in high school, only to have to repeat the same experiments on a college level. However, greater RECALL, never learning, is expected of the student, and therefore, he is forced, within this course, to MEMORIZE, never learn, the names of countless phylems, subphylems, kingdoms and God-knows what else classifications to accumulate three credits to add to his graduation. Nothing is learned, if so the barest minimum. The present instruction, for instance, in Biology is confusing, and will only destroy the student's interest, the little he may possess. However, if Biology is an impossibility, then chemistry or physics is totally out of the question. Therefore, the student has no choice. He has the opportunity, if he has been forewarned, to avoid the present Biology courses by taking it during the summer classes or in the evening where it is taught with a little more flexibility, and not on such a "graduate" level. However, if the student is not forewarned, it is a nightmarish experience, not worth three credits.

Backlash

Racism is the subject of a great deal of on-campus discussion these days. Paradoxically, the discussion is being led, and racism condemned, mainly by the Afro-American Organization, the campus's most racist body.

At Afro-Am's recent memorial service for Dr. Martin Luther King, racism was defined by the Afro-Am president as a set of responses which are different for situations involving solely white, than they are for situations involving both whites and blacks. It was also specified that the natural consequence of racism is the subjugation and oppression of the black people. But racism is more than that. It is simply a value system which puts one race or another at a disadvantage at a certain place, a certain time. It need not involve whites and blacks, or either one, and if it does involve blacks and whites, it can still work both ways. No race has anything approaching a monopoly on racism.

Except for a guest speaker from the NAACP, the memorial program was totally irrelevant to Dr. King. King was not a racist, he was a humanist. He was a non-violent. The program was racist in that the demands made of the administration by Afro-Am, which were discussed at the service, are racist, and speakers, notably Angelo Lewis and Adrian Dey, openly advocated violence. It hardly seemed a tribute to the noble works of Dr. King.

That the demands made by the Afro-American Organization are racist is easy enough to show. The first of these is a School of Black Studies. Not some courses relevant to the black experience and heritage, not a department, but a school, separate from, but equal to, the other schools. It sounds like Little Rock, and would also be much more expensive, unaimly, inefficient, impractical, and vulnerable to even more racism than is currently apparent than would be a coordinated group of courses offered by the already existing departments, each covering that aspect of the black experience, or of black culture, that falls in its domain. The only possible line of reasoning which would lead to the conclusion that a separate school would be advantageous would be one which views separation (segregation) as an advantage. Not that the separation would be required, only that it would be, in fact.

The second demand is for the student body to include 30% black students, the percentage of black residents in Hartford. This would be fair enough if the student body came almost solely from Hartford, and if a sufficient number of blacks had the ability, the capability, and the desire to attend. A sufficient number of blacks should have these qualities. If they do not, it is the fault of the system, and the system should be changed. But until the system is changed, we cannot act blindly, as if the fault were non-existent, and expect anything like favorable results. There will come a time, but the time is not yet come. And even when it does come, the quoted percentage will be inaccurate. At the present time, the majority of full-time students not only do not come from Hartford, they do not even come from Connecticut. And the trend is for the student body to come from an even larger geographic area in the future. However, more students will always come from Hartford than

from any other single area, so the fair portion of black students cannot come from anything so simple as a straight percentage. The fair portion will probably come to somewhat less than 30%, but that is pure conjecture.

Also demanded is that no black student be suspended without the consent of his peers, i.e. other black students. Not only is this blatant racism, it depends quite heavily upon the questionable assumption that any students should have a vote in whether a student is disciplined or not. Are the students themselves, especially the particular student's peer group, really in a position to judge fairly?

Afro-Am is demanding a budget of \$15,000. They present no proposals beyond the generally rather objectionable ones included in their current set of demands, yet they expect a gift of that size, purportedly to allow them to function. Yet \$15,000 is more than SFA is spending this year on any area other than publications and social functions. This demand would be more acceptable were it not for so large a sum of money being invested in an almost totally unknown proposition.

Demand number five takes the cake when it comes to racism. Besides asking(?) for a dorm complex named after black heroes, it states that black students should have preferential treatment in dorm placement, and should have the opportunity to room only with blacks, if they so desire. If a southern white says he can refuse to sell his house to a black, or refuse to let a black rent an apartment in his building, he's a racist. What makes these guys any different?

Demands are being made for representative percentages of black security guards, black regents, black coordinated and produced WWUH air time, black artists in residence, scholarships and fellowships for black students in need, a black Emergency Fund, a black newspaper, and a black library. It is interesting to note that when it comes to an area where blacks might be able to receive a higher percentage of the quantity in question than the percentage of black students, the percentage (stated as 30%) is not insisted upon, it is not even mentioned. It seems that blacks have a right to a minimum percentage of each function of the university, equal to the percentage of blacks attending the university. But

whites have no such right. It just points out the racism, and even the lack of integrity, inherent in the list of demands.

Separate black orientation and universal observance of black holidays are also demanded. A supplementary orientation for blacks, administered by blacks, might be feasible, if still not moral (the black leaders seem to be past the point of any morality, even their own), but this is not what is demanded. A separate black orientation would involve endless administrative difficulties, but these have been simply ignored. Universal observance of black holidays is a rather nebulous demand. How many "black holidays" are there in a school year? Who decides what is, and what is not, a black holiday? Does the administration simply eliminate the required number of class days, or does it extend the school year in either direction? Or do classes go on as normal, but there be compulsory attendance at some sort of service?

But the last demand is the beauty of the bunch. It is demanded that de facto segregation and racism end on campus. It hardly seems in keeping with the other eighteen.

Sincerely,
Cousin Elliot (not Dixon)

P.S. It has been pointed out since this writing that the published list uses the word "proposals" rather than "demands." But proposals accompanied by only slightly veiled threats are virtual demands.

Voting

Dear Representatives of
the S.F.A.,
(especially Freshman from A&S)

Too many times at S.F.A. meetings, Ben Holden has asked "Well, where are they?!!!" This is the question I present to you. Where were you?!! Even though you try to ignore it, you represent my vote in the policy making of our school. Even though I (as a non-voting auditor) can attend these meetings, you apparently cannot.

If you are not in attendance, I am not being represented. We, the students, elected you, and we did this with the understanding that you would REPRESENT US. You have not fulfilled your obligation to those you were elected by.

On April 10, a critical issue was to be presented: the Constitutional Proposals. Where were you then? Where are you now?

Bob Halpern
Freshman, A&S

Chekov's Corner

"Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that, stupid!"

Assistant Secretary of
Defense Arthur Sylvester, to
reporters.

All faculty and administration staff are invited to an

INFORMAL TEA

on

April 20 In Room G

at the Gengras Campus Center. The

AFRO-AMERICAN ORGANIZATION

will discuss, in depth, the proposals presented by this organization.