

RICHMOND TIMES

VOLUME II — No. 3



184

Richmond College of the City University of New York

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1968

MEMORANDUM

TO: Richmond Times
FROM: Dr. Marshall Suther
DATE: November 19, 1968

I understand that students are urgently concerned about two related but separate matters, the non-recommendation for reappointment of three members of the faculty, and student participation in the making of decisions on appointment of faculty members, both of which would seem to be legitimate subjects of student concern.

On the first matter, that of the three faculty members, I am not sure that everyone is fully and accurately informed as to what has occurred and what the future possibilities are. On October 28th the Personnel and Budget Committee of the Division of Humanities voted not to recommend reappointments for three members of the staff (the Committee is empowered only to make recommendations to the College P & B Committee, not to make appointments). On November 13th, the Divisional P & B Committee received from the three faculty members petitions to reconsider their decisions. After lengthy deliberation, which included hearing representations from four students and examining student petitions, the Committee failed to pass motions to act on each of the three petitions, on the ground that it had considered the three cases at great length, and that any further action would come more appropriately from a higher body. In short, the Committee neither granted nor denied the petitions — it refrained from acting upon them.

The three faculty members now have the right to appeal to the College-wide P & B Committee to conduct a full hearing of their cases. In the event of an adverse decision by that committee, the cases may be appealed to the President of the College. In short, on the supposition that appeals will be made, the matter is in mid-process, and any further actions called for can be expected to be taken both carefully and promptly.

On the matter of student participation in the making of decisions concerning appointments and promotions, there has been a great deal of discussion among the faculty, and my impression is that there is wide agreement that official and effective procedures must be established to bring student opinion in these matters to bear upon the decision-making process. Accordingly, the Chairman of the Division of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Professional Studies decided on November 13th to call meetings of their respective student bodies at the earliest practicable date to request that they elect a study committee to consult with the faculty in consideration of procedures for student consultation in academic affairs, including questions of personnel. The Division of Science and Engineering has already a committee that can serve this purpose.

Since effective student-faculty consultation can only take place among duly selected members of these two groups in the community, it is to be hoped that these meetings will take place in the very near future and that the joint faculty-student committees will succeed in devising procedures appropriate to each division.



The new chairman of our Student Council, Robert Arrindell.

COUNCIL ELECTION RESULTS

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Admissions and Standing Committee: | * Louis Rappaport — 103 |
| * Howard Bender — 162 | * Robert Arrindell — 196 |
| * John Hart — 165 | * Jack Smith — 135 |
| Cultural & Public Affairs Committee: | Thomas Cook — 128 |
| * Sandra Zummo — 148 | Grievance Committee: |
| Stuart Porosoff — 83 | Fred Miller — 110 |
| Curriculum & Instruction Committee: | * Robert Newmark — 170 |
| Daniel Holliday — 54 | Sam Parab — 83 |
| Mary Healey — 95 | * Russ Rueger — 115 |
| | * Barry Teitelbaum — 161 |
| | ** Denotes winners |

The Lecture: Hans Morgenthau

By STAN GOLOVE

United States foreign policy is "obsolete, devised in basic principles twenty years ago, and since then, the rest of the world has radically changed." With that critical analysis, Hans Morgenthau, noted author and critic, and newly appointed Professor of Political Science at the City University of New York, addressed the students and faculty of Richmond College on October 28, 1968.

Professor Morgenthau said that a new foreign policy must be created to deal with a changed world and that the U.S. must come to terms with the following five problems areas:

- 1) relations with its allies; 2) relations with the communist world; 3) relations with the uncommitted nations; 4) the destructiveness of nuclear weapons; 5) the problems of the U.S. internally.

"NATO has a symbolic rather than military function," said the professor, "for the twenty-five divisions of NATO could never have hoped to stop hundreds of Soviet Pact troops in Europe. Rather, NATO was set up to act as a trip-wire — a thin line set up 1945, which, if crossed by Russia, meant war with the U.S." He went on to say that the problems of the U.S., with its allies in general, and with the French in particular, are the results of contradictions in our foreign policy. These contradictions are shown in Cuba and Vietnam policies and could lead to war with Red China and Russia. The contradiction here is that Cuba and Vietnam, although no threat to Europe, could have involved European NATO forces in a war with Russia, while the U.S. refused to take a hard stand through NATO in Berlin, which

is a direct threat to Europe.

Later, he said, "communism is not the same as it was fifteen or twenty years ago. It isn't as centrally controlled. It is a number of different communisms each defined in terms of its own particular national interests." We are in Vietnam to stop the spread of communism, but which one? Of Russia? Of Peking? Or Hanoi? Which one?"

The Professor was most critical of the U.S. policy against revolutionary nations and revolutionary movements.

He was most admiring of De Gaulle as a statesman.

The Professor attacked the military idea of measuring military strength . . . " . . . it is absurd to feel you are more powerful if you can destroy your enemy ten times over."

He continued by attacking the setting up of missiles for defense by saying, "Anti-missile defenses that are 90% effective are useless, for the 10% that do get through will kill you almost as much as if the other 90% got through too."

Professor Morgenthau finished by saying that the United States must deal with the question, "What do we want to accomplish as a nation among nations?"

College Counseling Center Advises

Recently for some unexplained reasons, rumors have been circulating in regard to the confidentiality of a student's contact with the Richmond College Counseling Center. At this point, it may be both helpful and appropriate to reiterate and reemphasize that all contacts at the Counseling Center are strictly confidential. More specifically, no reports about the contact will be issued without the written permission of the client nor will the contact be recorded anywhere on the student's transcript or in his academic file.

Based on his own experience with them, Dean Chiles assures students that members of the counselling staff are extremely reticent even in mentioning their interviews. He has heard counselors boldly vow to risk contempt of court charges rather than divulge information that might be unfairly injurious to a student. He adds that our counselors keep their secrets from everyone with a tenacity that the outside world would have to see to believe.

DIVISIONAL STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

The Student Council has approved the following students to the Faculty-Student Advisory Committee. The Committees are being set up in all divisions of the College.

Division of Humanities:

1) Curriculum and Instruction: Jack Smith.

2) Honors and Independent Study: Mel Lichenstein.

3) Articulation With the Division of Professional Studies: Katty Passera.

4) Articulation with other Colleges: Glen Cohms.

5) Graduate Instruction: Diana Newman.

6) Library: Barbara Hall.

Division of Social Sciences:

1) Summer School: Wilson Cameron.

2) Graduate School: Robert Arrindale, Jean-Louis d'Heilly.

3) Admission and Standing: Bohdan S. Kosovych.

4) Curriculum: Vincent Nervianno.

5) Professional Education: Standing and Articulation: Stuart Porosoff.

6) Ad Hoc Committee on Regulation of Masters of Science in Elementary Education: Barry Shapiro.

7) Committee on Curriculum: Donald Eisman.

Committee on Certification and Licensing on Teacher Education: Louis Rappaport.

Division of Natural Science and Engineering: Have not set up any official committees.

In This Issue

- Editorials ----- Page 2
Letters to the Editor -- Page 2
Movie Reviews ----- Page 3
Play Reviews ----- Page 3
Club News ----- Page 4



Richmond College party time. Did you miss it? Next time, come!

RICHMOND TIMES130 Stuyvesant Place
Staten Island, New York, N. Y. 10301

VOLUME II

NUMBER 3

Editor-in-Chief
CHARLOTTE FINKENTHALManaging Editor
STAN GOLOVNews Editor
JOYCE JEIDELFeature Editor
ED BARNARDTechnical Editor
CHARLES P. RUBENSTEINBusiness Manager ----- **ERIC STERLING**STAFF—Bohdan Kosovych, Maryanna Barnet, Felicin Miceli,
Jim Buechler**ON BINDING INSTEAD OF LOOSENING—
OR, THE RIVALRY FOR THE POT**By **CHARLOTTE FINKENTHAL & ED BARNARD**

The recent letter circulated by Mike Russek is an example of what is going on in our school. We would like to make answer to him with regard to his Title, "Shit or get off the pot!" We are not exactly certain as to what he was driving at, but we do acknowledge what a mess the "pot" is in.

The frequent turnover of the Student Council is of concern to interested students. We reporters are among those interested. More interest is needed, we all agree, but how this is done is where we do not agree. One thing is certain, you don't attract people by infantile example. Some of the Council had refused to give interviews, claiming that what had happened was too "personal" to allow the student body or newspaper to know about. Now, is that any way to treat those who are interested? Our newspaper has not assaulted any of the Student Government members.

We grant that the number of officers open was as small as the number of students who applied. We too, work with very limited

numbers. But we would remind you, Mike, that this is still a new college and things take time to establish.

As for our "ragtag" sheet, please increase our budget and we will purchase better paper.

What becomes most apparent is a failure for certain students to community or accept responsibility. Serving others is not always a matter of "glory," and it usually is more a thankless task done by those who realize that somebody has to do the job. What you have done in your letter to the student body and **Richmond Times**, is to destroy good will and establish a rivalry. It is time for people to put aside ego and prestigious titles, and, instead, extend a humble hand and just do the job. Interestingly, those who grab the titles are quick to resign when things don't go their way. How can there be stability that way? Perhaps, student responsiveness would be increased if, instead of battering them, you would try a soft sell, and set an example in good will.

IMPORTANT:

Articles appearing in the **Richmond Times** do not necessarily reflect the opinion of all members of staff.

Academic Freedom?By **CHARLOTTE FINKENTHAL**

President of Brooklyn College (1939-66), Harry Gideonse is in the news again. An unusual event occurred on the night of October 14th, but before we go into that, we must include a little background information for those who do not know him.

Dr. Gideonse is now the Chancellor of the New School for Social Research, in Manhattan. This is interesting, especially after his notorious actions while at Brooklyn College. Let us, as scholars, look at the man in historical perspective. The facts include his testifying as a friendly witness before the Rapp-Coudert investigating committee in 1940. Three faculty members resigned as a result. In 1951 he suspended the *Vanguard*, a Brooklyn College newspaper, following an editorial which was critical of the Brooklyn College administration. Eight students were suspended; in 1953 he testified before the Senate Internal Sub-Committee (McCarran Comm.). As a result of this hearing, eight faculty members lost their positions. The faculty member who informed on them, Dr. Harry Albaum, is now Dean of Graduate Studies at Brooklyn; 1965 saw Professor Robert Sitton fired after he rescinded his loyalty oath, while students protested against the college's policies. These are merely part of Dr. G's accomplishments. Actually, there is no reliable way of telling how many other professors or students were silenced without public knowledge, or how many got in line and restricted their opinion. The greatest loss was done to academic freedom!

And what about the college atmosphere of free inquiry? One might well ask, "What price academic purity?" And why, furthermore, is the student needful of protection against unpopular "ideas"?

Dr. G. was conducting his course, the other night, at the New School on, of all things, "Academic Freedom," when dissident students disrupted things so completely that he summoned the police. After this failed to restore order, he cancelled it for the evening. He probably hasn't heard the last of things yet.

Dr. G. is not the only anti-communist educator of the McCarthy witch-hunt era. Professor Sidney Hook of NYU hunts down those who "infect" wholesome American students. One wonders about theories like "ends justify means" when watching it at home.

The New School newspaper carried an interesting article called "Gideonse Bible" which reveals his sense of "mission." Thank goodness the *Torquemada's of Academia* don't live in Richmond College.

LETTERS**AN OPEN LETTER
TO PRESIDENT SCHUELER**

"Implicit in the basic philosophy of Richmond College is a strong commitment to faculty involvement, since the aims of an academic program that stresses interdivisional and independent study can be realized only with the full participation of the faculty," (page 7, R.C. catalogue.)

Three members of the faculty who have most conscientiously fulfilled this objective have been denied reappointment by the Personnel and Budgetary committee of the Humanities Division.

The reasons given by the committee are obviously mere technicalities. The actual reasons are known only to each member of the committee. We suspect that petty personal and political ambitions as not unlikely motivations.

A large portion of the student body and a heavy majority of Humanities Division students contest the methods and actions taken by the committee as being distinctly unfair. They arbitrarily subjected themselves to certain rules and regulations of the CUNY charter and ignored others. For one thing, they did not determine the teachers scholarship by in-class examination. They did not bother to take a concensus of student opinion. When the students submitted a protest petition, they refused to consider it. These are hardly open minded procedures one would expect from a progressive school.

We believe that the behavior of the committee in this matter has been antithetical to the philosophy of Richmond College. You, as the President, have been responsible for the concept and establishment of R.C. You are also largely responsible for its direction. You have the power, under the five-year suspension of the CUNY charter, to act with major influence in this crisis.

We feel that this is the first true test of the Administration's conviction in experimental education. The three dismissed teachers have represented to us, what, in fact, is successful progressive education.

We appeal to you not to allow the myopic precedent set by the Humanities P & B committee to stand firm. A 'good' administration is marked by intelligence, stability and student revolution. A great administration is made by intelligence applied in conjunction with courage. We hope you won't disappoint us, thus making it easier for us not to disappoint you.

Carl Nardiello
Humanities Division Student

WHERE TO GO?By **RICHARD BASCETTA**

Three professors at Richmond College have not been reappointed. All three happen to be more dedicated and involved in student lives than any of the other faculty members in their division. For two, academic competency is unquestionable. They are scholars in their respective fields — unsurpassed by any of their colleagues in abroit handling of subject matter. As a group, they represent to the humanities students, the avant garde involvement and concern for students; this faculty represent for them not only academic potentialities, but individual problems with unique hopes and promises.

Since the inception of the school,

Richmond Has Many WindowsBy **JOYCE JEIDEL**

On Friday, November 8, the Personnel and Budget Committee of the Division of Humanities (Profs. Suther, Brooks, Bogen, Cooley, Hinz, Mattfeld, Rodriguez) informed Professors Cullen, Kagle and Truesdell that they would not be reappointed for the coming academic year. All three instructors involved felt that no objective criteria of judgment was employed, but rather that personality and divisional politics were the determining factors in the decision. They considered that such reasons as the Committee did give for their dismissal were either specious or based on inadequate investigation. Contrary to the requirement of the CUNY By-Laws, their performance in the classroom was never observed by any member of the Committee, nor was there any examination of their scholarship. Furthermore, their students were never consulted concerning effectiveness as teachers, their value as advisers, or their contribution to the student community. The student reaction was immediate. The students of the instructors in question circulated a petition to express dismay at the P & B action. It was soon found that support of these instructors existed on a much larger basis than only those who had taken classes with them; the petition accumulated over 200 signatures. Students flocked to members of the divisional Committee and to the instructors' colleagues in the division and in the College as a whole to register their protest. They were joined by instructors from other divisions who expressed their concern and support. On Wednesday, November 13, the dismissed instructors petitioned the Committee to reconsider the decision. That evening the Committee met, but refused to reconsider the petitions. The professors must now appeal to the Faculty-wide Personnel and Budget Committee.

The matter of these three teachers' reappointment may ultimately be a dead one, but the principle under which they were dismissed is very much alive. This vital subject will reoccur; there is no certainty that those members of the faculty (except those with tenure) who made this decision will not be touched themselves. In fact, every member of the faculty can be judged as were the three teachers from the Humanities Division.

The failure of the Personnel and Budget Committee of the Division of Humanities to consider student opinion in their initial decision not to reappoint Professors Cullen, Kagle, and Truesdell and their refusal to reconsider their earlier decision despite widespread student protest make clear the necessity for establishing formal channels through which this opinion can be expressed. Various possibilities have been suggested whereby the students can express their opinions on the hiring, firing and promoting of instructors. Perhaps the most controversial of these is the suggestion of student voting membership on divisional and college-wide P&B committees. The problem, of course, is to make this vote representative of student opinion at large and prevent its becoming the expression of merely one student's opinion. The solution to this problem would be to establish a committee of students for each division which would examine the merits of all instructors as they directly pertain to the students. This committee would consider such matters as teaching effectiveness, availability to students for consultation, and service to students in other than official capacities. These student-committees on instructors would not receive the private documents in any instructor's dossier. Their recommendations would be based instead on course-evaluation sheets, opinions expressed by individuals to the committee, and the instructor's record of involvement in student affairs. Unless this system, with these safeguards, is instituted, the probability of student opinion having an effective role in the decision-making process of the divisional P&B committees is minimal, and we will be left with the old system of whereby internal politics, personality conflicts, and caprice determine who is to remain and who is to be promoted. The old system, as we can see from our sister colleges and from colleges across the country, has bred strikes, sit-ins, riots, mutual distrust between students, faculty and administration — all of which are inadequate substitutes for the effective expression of opinion through rational and structured lines of communication. Our participational theme is a familiar one at the college; Richmond College began by departing from the rigid structures of traditional institutions. In a word, the whole quality of our education is at stake, and Richmond has many windows.

a little over a year ago, these faculty members have established a rapport with divisional students unmatched by any of the other divisional faculty members. All three have certainly been more accessible to students than any of the voting members of the Humanities Personnel and Budgetary committee. Their willingness to see any student, whether he be a classroom student or a student from another division just needful of some advice, has not been a facade. At almost any time during the day you will find their doors open to anyone. They have become the most popular instructors on the sixth floor, if only because they are there to be consulted. What can the members of the P&B say about their own availability: Can it equal that of the three candidates? I think not. A concensus of student opinion would substantiate this. Most likely they will ignore this comment, just as they refused to acknowledge the student petition to reconsider their

recommendation of non-reappointment.

Richmond College was originally conceived on the idea of progress through experimentation. The new "liberalized" programs of study were designed to develop a self-reliant student body along with quote, "a faculty commitment to involvement." This is what the school bulletin said. The enrollment of a student body from all five boroughs and from various economic and social backgrounds is academic. What has happened during the past fourteen months is not — it is pathetic. What is existing at Richmond College? We have apathy and mediocrity quickly replacing autonomous direction and involvement. Instead of fostering a community of awareness through communication, this college is slowly becoming an insensitive, disharmonious, formalized institution. I therefore find the decision of the committee to dismiss one of its members because they felt

(Continued on Page 4)



The Folk File

By JIM BUECHLER

Tom Paxton on Disc and on Record

Tom Paxton came back to Philharmonic Hall on Nov. 1 and, accompanied only by his guitar, gave a performance which spanned the breadth of his wide repertoire. He doesn't have to rely on old standards (or chestnuts), and sang a dozen songs that have not appeared on any of his four Elektra albums. These included the all time "quickie," "Here's to Spiro Agnew, and all the things he's done."

Had Tom been a vocalist doing other people's songs, he would have had a hard time; his voice is harsh and even grating. But his ballads, "Leaving London," "We didn't Know," "Ramblin' Boy," and "The Last Thing on My Mind," were done with much more tenderness and control than he shows on his recordings and were highlights of the concert.

Paxton has always been considered a topical songwriter. Commenting on the nature of his craft, he wryly stated that he has to prepare for the time when a

song becomes outdated. His cure has been to rewrite the necessary verses, as he has done with "Lyndon Johnson Told the Nation" and "Daily News, Daily Blues," two of his most popular numbers.

He is best described nowadays as a "songmaker" for, as his latest album "Morning Again" shows, he deals with the police state that millions of Americans seem to long for ("Mr. Blue"). "So Much For Winning" tells of the void created when a boy loses his girl; things seem quite unimportant to him. The degradation and emptiness of a prostitute's life are shown in "The Hooker." Other songs that deal with more than the "here and now" are also in this album.

Overall, Paxton has definitely made better albums, notably "Ramblun Boy" and "Ain't That News?" his first two. Many bands on "Morning Again" are flawed. "So Much For Winning," for example, whines repetitiously for seven minutes. Others are marred by crass and insipid orchestration. While his songs from earlier albums were tight, Paxton now seems content with trite filler as in "Morning Again," and "Clarissa Jones."

On Entertainment

By ED BARNARD

"We Bombed In New Haven" Joseph Heller, author of the anti-war novel *Catch 22*, has captured; in his first play, brilliant moments. "We Bombed in New Haven" concerns a group of actors who are in a war play. They act out the roles of major, captain, flyers, nurse, and are content with their roles. At one point the flyers go out on a mission and something strange happens. One actor does not return... he has been killed.

From this point on, Heller has his actors assume the roles of actors and real soldiers interchangeably so often that they do not know what is real and what is imaginary. When they bomb a city, they justify their actions by saying that their superiors ordered them to — they really didn't want to do it. When they are instructed that they have to die, however, and they see that the other actors have not returned, they begin to fear for themselves.

Heller is definitely anti-war in this one. At times he has his actors talk to the audience and ask them if they care whether one actor or another dies, whether or not the war continues. What he is asking of the well dressed and comfortable theater goers is the same question that many soldiers ask themselves — does anyone back home really care?

We see the futility of war in the coming deaths of two young boys. As one says, "They felt that if I get killed while my life isn't complicated, then my death will be less complicated." How sad, one feels... it is so true.

Few plays have such evenly perfect performances. Jason Roberts is the captain, happy at first that he has the lead role, sorry later, when he has to send someone close to him off to his death. Diana Sands is the nurse who wants a bigger part. Both are excellent and perform with great skill. William Federik is the major who acts as catalyst, establishing whether or not the action is real.

Towards the end, one wants to smash his head in, much as Roberts would for making the game all too real. He is fine in the role. Anthony Holland is perfectly dry and bitchy as Corp. Bailey.

There is one actor in particular, Ron Leibman, who stands out from the rest of the cast, granted it is an excellent role to begin with. He plays an actor confused as to whether what is happening is real or not. When the awful truth is revealed, he tries to leave the company; he is scheduled to be blown up in a raid. His terror of death and fear of war is mirrored beautifully in his performance. He is excellent in a role which allows his emotions to run the gamut from A to Z. A less competent actor could have been a disaster in this part.

Lighting by John Gleason is as ineffective as it is in his other show "The Great White Hope." Rittman's set design is very clever and allows the actors to act, while they move it, and not a moment is lost.

It is, perhaps, John Hirsh's rapid pace direction that makes "We bombed in New Haven" the great evening it is. It is a fast moving show and, for this reason, surpasses its biggest dramatic competition "The Great White Hope," because of that shows tendious place. This show has a lot to say. For a truly thought provoking, excellently staged and acted evening in the theater, "We Bombed in New Haven" is a must.

POETIC PROTEST

In Protest of the P & B decision regarding Kagel, Cullen and Truesdell.

By ERIC APPLGATE

Even the most liberal professors
Even the most ignorant students
Even the most conservative professors

Protest students
Elementary professors;
Some think they are better,
of course (with affection)

And there is talk
Talk
Of Prof. A
Disliking C and an affair with D
Opposed to A
Who knows student Z
On committee Qx
With Eliot
Opposed in form
While 9 watches 10 with K
Who dislikes C,
See?

Playbill Corner

By CHARLES RUBENSTEIN

"George M!"

"George M!" stars Joel ("Cabaret") Grey, and is a recap of the life and loves of George M. Cohan. I first saw Cohan in the person of James Cagney on film. Unfortunately, although he gives a spirited performance, Grey cannot equal Cagney's Cohan. A tribute to the man and his music, though short on plot, "George M!" is an enjoyable evening of good songs and superb choreography.

"The People vs. Ranchman"

Accused rapist, mother seducer, and homosexual, Ranchman R. Ranchman is brought to trial and electrocuted, then brought to trial and gassed, then brought to trial and assassinated before being hanged.

One becomes a part of the play when pro and anti-Ranchman forces try to sway the audience to their sides. As it turns out he is innocent, but has been killed three times and the audience has not tried to stop it. Perhaps this is an allegory to the Chessman case of a few years ago. An absorbing plea against capital punishment.



**The President's Series
LECTURE**

MONDAY, DEC. 9, 1968

**RALPH ELLISON, Author of
THE INVISIBLE MAN
and
SHADOW AND ACT**

TOPIC:

"The Meaning of American Diversity"

11:00 A.M. Room 805, Richmond College,
130 Stuyvesant Pl., S.I. N. Y.

"Land of Opportunity?"

By ERIC STERLING

This is a land of hope for everyone. And this holds true for a man like President-elect Richard M. Nixon, who, when given a second chance rose to the highest public office in our country. This second chance holds true for, and pardon the term, the WASP — especially one with money. Sometimes one must build bridges with those with whom we disagree. We have gotten many promises from Mr. Nixon and the Presidency was our gift to him. Hopefully we may say that he is not the kind of person who 'prom-

ised them anything but gave them the same,' or is he? Will the U.S. remain stagnant in its polluted sameness or will the U.S. march on to peaceful (or violent) changes in its social, moral and philosophical outlook and bridge the abyss that exists between the establishment and the minority groups. Mr. Nixon says that his first task is to work to unite our country.

He has come to the right place at the needed time. As our local expression goes 'whats your bag?' His bag is unifying America, and this is part of your bag too. So, how about all of us getting into the same bag??? No Man is an island. . . .

LETTERS

(Continued from Page 2)

that he would be better suited at a structured, formalized institution, ironical and absurdly ludicrous.

The whole notion of progress has either been distorted or never initially realized. Since it is the duty of the faculty and more importantly, the administration to define the path of progress, some of us who are concerned have waited. I would even venture to ask what most define as progress. Is progress building the Verazzano-Narrows Bridge for Staten Island conservatism? Or is "progress" increased accessibility to admission to this school so that 95% of its students are unaware or unconcerned about progress. I would conject that the percentage of students are not cognizant of two real crisis which have occurred in school this year. The first went virtually unnoticed by students. The second is going on now.

Progress is digression. It is concerted deviation from dilapidated norms of academic institutions. It is escape from mediocrity and intellectual sterility. It is the destruction of monolithic administrations, indifferent faculties, ambiguous direction; paths which are circuitous leading only to rhetoric gestures of future progress. Progress must be the metamorphosis of established direction when that direction has proved so absurdly insipid. Finally, it has to be a ejection of shallow, petty political behavior of reputed scholars, and the educated elite of our community.

The administration and the faculty are not fully responsible for the absence of leadership and direction. In a democracy there can be no progress without concern. The present crisis involves a threat to the original expectation of such progress. These candidates are more than three dedicated, competent faculty members. They represent an articulated, so far undefined digression from the stagnation.

So there is an issue at stake. In which direction will Richmond College go? Where do you want it to go? As students you have substantive rights. Freedom of the press, freedom of expression; self-denial of each is self-censorship.

Part of the inherent promise of this school is being threatened. The college wide P&B committee will meet to decide the decision of the Humanities P&B committee. If you respond, then they must. Some of us are outraged at what has happened. We will dissent until this issue is resolved.

To the Editor:

Concerning elections, what a farce! The student elections of Richmond College were, unfortunately, too similar to this country's national elections. The major similarities are that of no choice, and no other recourse for action. Most notable among the winners (Ha!) was John Hart, crusader of "the Id," the defunct "underground newspaper," and "Pravda." What part will this comedian play in the farce?

However, there is a solution, government men: resign, each one resign. Hold free elections with no imposed candidates. This will provide real freedom of choice.

—Louis Fraser

Editor's reply:

If your suggestion were followed, we might need a full-time staff to count the votes. Possibly every student would vote for

TRIP TO MONTREAL

November 29-December 1

Cost: \$16.00 round trip bus fare

Contact: 666-6812

HEMISPHERIC CONFERENCE TO
END THE WAR IN VIETNAM130 MORNINGSIDE DRIVE
NEW YORK CITY 10027HEAR: David Dellinger, Wilfred Muuchett,
Dr. Cheddi Jagan,Representatives of the NLF,
Canadian and Latin peace group leaders,
Rabbi A. FEINBERG (author "Hanoi Diary"),
and many, many others.

SEE: The beautiful Montreal, and La Belle Provence.

Co-Chairmen: Ossie Davis, Dagmar Wilson

Neither Here Nor There

By STAN GOLOVE

For this issue I was thinking of writing something really inspiring or philosophical or even, to be with the times, radical. I was going to write about, maybe, how I felt when I heard Nixon won the election by only 50,000 votes, but I figured there would be plenty of time to write about that later. Maybe, I thought, I could write about how that great political boss, Mayor Daley, couldn't deliver Illinois to HHH (who had begged to get Daley's support in Chicago). Alas, HHH learned his lesson and Mayor Daley hopefully may be suffocated by all his bodyguards and by all the people who pay homage to him.

So, what could I write about? About my school? No, nothing is happening here. Dammit that's it! Nothing is happening here and why not? Don't get me wrong, some students are doing some things (such as Theatre 81), but it doesn't effect most of the students. We have to have, and could have, the most progressive school in the city. I know faculty members from other colleges who saw the courses given here and wondered if (while they couldn't get a teaching position here), they could take some of the courses. The governing of the college, if taken advantage of fully by all the students (and if lead by stu-

dent leaders who care) could lead to greater student participation on the Board of Higher Education (or a seat on the BHE), to say nothing of what we could do for our school — for ourselves. Yet, among the students, faculty, and administration there is a lack of enthusiasm and excitement. In the past weeks Professor Morgenthau spoke, and though he said nothing really spectacular, what he did say should have sparked some discussion. But nothing happened! A publication called "ID" was distributed, but, the only thing anybody talked about was the pictorial cover, instead of discussing what these people had to say and why it had to come out in an underground fashion. A fine play "Futz" by a very talented group, the La Mama Players, was shown, without even a ripple about what it meant.

Dear Editor:

In the last page of your last issue, you had the Richmond seal that I presume was done by someone on the newspaper. This seal is way off course. Firstly, Staten Island is not bridged to New York as shown on the seal. Secondly, I don't think that Staten Islanders are illiterate as the seal suggests; the Island has several other colleges on the Island.

—Eric Sterling

Why? How come? Can anybody explain to me what is really happening? Is everybody working after school? Does everybody have to rush home for supper at 6 o'clock? We are all taking heavy amounts of credits (and we all would like to graduate eventually), but I thought college was more than a 9-5 job; that there was supposed to be something else there — excitement, controversy, ideas, and involvement in what's happening around us so we don't become like our elders, soft, middle-class, and APATHETIC.

I wish I had the answer, but I guess if I did come up with one, most of the people here wouldn't really care anyway. Maybe I'm wrong? Or maybe it's just me? Will somebody out there please let me know!

YEARBOOK

Anyone having suggestions for what should go into the YEARBOOK, please put them in the suggestion box in the lobby or in room 520.

This is how the staff of RICHMOND TIMES feels at the end of the day in room #520!

Student Representatives
On The Board of
Higher Education

A call has gone out to give both students and faculty seats on the Board of Higher Education. The request was sent to Mayor Lindsay by Queens College Student Association President Glen Brunman and Phoenix Editor-in-Chief Bob Wolf.

In the letter Mr. Brunman and Mr. Wolf said that students were, "in a unique position today. They are totally disenfranchised and powerless as far as the Board of Higher Education is concerned and yet are expected to accept its power and leadership." The letter went on, "institutions which prepare students to live and act in a democratic society must themselves be democratic and representative . . . and institution which totally disregards democratic procedures is laying the groundwork for the creation of a group of people who do not believe there remains democratic values in society, and so seek anarchistic alternatives . . . Students and faculty can no longer

be expected to passively obey the laws of the Board of Higher Education when they are given no power in formulating these laws." The letter ends by calling on the Mayor to "correct a longstanding injustice by giving students and faculty a full share and voice in a system of which they are the most essential elements."

The Board of Higher Education is composed of twenty-one people who are chosen by the Mayor, with the help of an advisory board, to serve nine year terms. At the present time there is a vacant seat on the Board and another will become vacant on July 1, 1969. The Mayor, as yet, has not responded to the letter and his aides say he is busy with other matters.

President Brunman and Editor Wolf are requesting the joint cooperation of students and faculty on all campuses of the City University to get Mayor Lindsay to change the "archaic and autocratic system" which is the Board of Higher Education. In response to this request the Student Council at Richmond College has passed a motion backing the student's request.

REGULARLY SCHEDULED
JET FLIGHTS TO EUROPE
BOAC - AIR FRANCE - TWA

Code	Departs	Destination	Returns	Airfare
A	June 12	Paris	September 4	\$265.00
B	June 22	Madrid via Lisbon	September 3	\$225.00
C	July 1	Paris	August 14	\$265.00
D	July 1	London	September 3	\$245.00
E	August 4	London	September 2	\$245.00

Available to City University Students, Faculty and Staff.

MR. NATHAN GREENSPAN

68 EAST 19th STREET
BROOKLYN, NEW YORK 11226
BU 4-5749

Simmons Group Journeys

Note: There will be a \$12.00 administrative fee per person in addition to the above fares.

CLUB NEWS

Lou Boden and Lucy Ghignone were elected officers of the Inter-Club Activities Council (ICAC). Mr. Boden will serve as Chairman and Miss Ghignone will serve as Vice-Chairman.

ICAC is composed of all the clubs at Richmond College and serves as a recommending body to the student council. Mr. Boden described his duties as that of "coordinating, supervision, and drawing all the multi-phased activities of the clubs of ICAC into one cohesive unit."

In other action ICAC has decided to:

1) Sponsor dances to be held every other week at different times of the week. Louis Fraser has been picked to serve as coordinator of the committee set up to handle the events.

2) Suspend the Menorah Society charter and budget till it comes up with a sufficient number of members.

3) Start work on a Winter Carnival by picking a committee made up of Al Cirigliano, Ed Browne, Laurel O'Mara, Joan Di-Raimondo and Ed Barnard to look into it.

4) Recommend that Tuesdays and Thursdays from the hours of 11-1 be set aside as club hours.

5) Charter a chess club and a publication called "Richmond College Opinion;" investigate the possibility of jointly sponsoring a concert of the "Up With People" group with other colleges of Staten Island to be presented free of charge to the people of Staten Island.

In a final piece of business ICAC refused to handle the problem of the newly formed Golf Club. The Golf Club had requested funds to buy certain equipment. However, since the club discriminates against any person, whatever the reason, the matter was returned to the Student Council and the Student Life Committee for action.

