

# Σ KAN Δ A Λ O N

Vol. 1, No. 7

February 11, 1963

"LET EACH BECOME ALL THAT HE IS  
CAPABLE OF PAYING..."

By Jan Dyckman

"It is not too much to expect the individual student to contribute in a modest way (to higher education), so long as the resultant costs do not deny the very opportunity which State University was created to provide."

-Report of the Board of Trustees  
\*\*\*\*\*

Many people have argued that the proposed tuition will "deny" many students the "opportunity" of low cost higher education. These people may "contribute" themselves out of a higher education. This is the most personal and the most emotional argument against tuition. But aside from this argument and the political insinuations that have arisen, one must look at the feasibility of the Trustees' proposals. To attain the ends they have deemed worthwhile, they have ignored a fundamental tenet of democracy-- education for all at public expense.

The primary reason for the Trustees' tuition was that the increase in the amount of money that would be available could be used for the expansion facilities of the University. They envision an increase in the number of students in the state, and an increase in the facilities necessary. However, having asked students for so much money, they will actually be eliminating some of the students that they hope for. They will be getting more money to build facilities for fewer students.

Will the money collected really go for its intended purpose? The cost of administering the tuition policy and the accompanying Scholar Incentive Program will consume most of the tuition to be collected.

The Scholar Incentive awards are merely attempting to assuage  
(cont. on next column)

THE OTHER SIDE  
By Alan Minarcik

The State University of New York has been swept by a wave of deep emotion. Out of deep conviction, hundreds marched around the college buildings, assembled for mass rallies, and braved the cruel elements carrying placards against the insidious evil of tuition. Now that some of the emotional fervor has abated, it might be interesting if a calm appraisal of the new tuition charge might be considered.

Within the State University there are many inequalities in the tuition policy. The amount charged for school fees and/or tuition varies from unit to unit (e.g., a student at Harpur College pays \$325 per year since he takes Liberal Arts). At State by taking a few education courses, one has been able to save considerable money. By charging a uniform tuition, the inequalities which now exist will be eliminated. (Tuition is being charged at 27 units of the State University now).

Of course, this administrative problem is of little consolation to the 35,200 students who are now faced with the extra costs of tuition.

(continued on p. 2, col. 1)  
the feelings of those involved. Having instituted uniform tuition rates, the Trustees hope to make this stipend on a basis of net taxable family income. Being realistic, then, there will be no "uniform tuition." And no matter how much Scholar Incentive is praised, most students will still have to pay more money.

In the past, the State saw that it was beneficial to its people, but now it seems to negate this concept. The tuition policy set up by the Board of Trustees can not accomplish what it hopes, fiscally, and it will have an adverse effect on the morale of the students. The motto of the State University of New York should read: Let each become all he is capable of paying."

Hardship is a cause pleaded by many. However, it should be noted that a Scholar Incentive program will be available to all based upon need. If one's income is less than \$1800, the stipend will cover the full amount of the new tuition charge. It is very likely that people may earn several times that amount and still get a maximum award from the State. To these people the new tuition will be no imposition.

For those whose income exceeds \$1800 the amount provided by the Scholar Incentive will be based upon need. Thus the new tuition should not deter people from attending the State University. The Board of Trustees is not trying to prevent capable students from attending its schools and educational institutions. Compared to other college and universities, New York State will impose very moderate fees to its university students. Why was the tuition charged? It was not, as is commonly supposed, the caprice of the Board of Trustees. We are able to see on our own campus that ours is a University in transition. A tremendous capital program is underway. Where does the money come from? The taxpayers of New York State are burdened with a 2.9 billion dollar budget. (43% of which goes to education.) The Board of Trustees is attempting to anticipate the financial obligations of the various units of S.U.N.Y.

The current expansion program will involve over a billion dollars in the next 10 years. Even with tuition, the State is paying the preponderance of this sum. With enrollments at all units trebling, with the improvement of current facilities, it seems unlikely (and unfair) that tax revenues should cover the entire amount. If we are to increase funds for the University, a tuition had to be assessed.

The Board of Trustees did not conceive the idea of a tuition hastily but analyzed the problem carefully. The State University is not trying to bar students but facilitate the enrollment of an increased number of students. According to the January 28, 1963, issue of the State University Newsletter, "The Trustees have an inescapable obligation to achieve the objectives of the expansion... (the State will meet its major obligations to S.U.N.Y.) It is (continued on next column)

not too much to expect the individual student to contribute in a modest way." Since the State is attempting to remain in the spirit of a public university, it is doubtful that costs will skyrocket.

Why does the Student body oppose tuition? The primary motive is the financial factor. However, we must also think of this in the context of an expanding university. The increase in fees is due to an attempt on the part of New York State to provide a better educational opportunity for its students.

Now that we have shown our signs of objection, let us now meet the challenge of the University. Let us now concentrate on its primary function: education. We owe this to ourselves, to our future professions, and to our society.

////////////////////////////////////  
// CALENDAR OF EVENTS //  
////////////////////////////////////

// WEDNESDAY, Feb. 13, 12 noon: //  
// Chapel Service, the Unitarian //  
// Church. //

// WEDNESDAY, Feb. 13, 4:00 p.m.: //  
// The Rev. Robert Starbuck: //  
// Christian Existence in a Marxist //  
// Society, Student Center //

// SATURDAY, Feb. 16, 2:30 p.m.: //  
// The Freedom Singers in Bru //  
// Lower Lounge. //

// WEDNESDAY, Feb. 20, 12 noon: //  
// Chapel Service, the Unitarian //  
// Church. //  
////////////////////////////////////

"Skandalon", a bi-weekly journal of news and opinion published by Campus Christian Council, invites articles, essays, poems, drawings on political, academic and theological questions. Contributions can be left at the Student Center, 166 Central Avenue, or with Linda Van Buren or Alan Minarcik.

STARBUCK TO RELATE BERLIN EXPERIENCES

The Rev. Robert Starbuck, for five years a "fraternal worker" in Germany, will be on campus Wednesday, February 13, to interview students interested in serving overseas as teachers and social workers under the Board for World Ministries of the United Church of Christ. Interested persons can arrange to see him through the Placement Office (R172).

Also, he will speak at 4:00 p.m. at the Student Center (166 Central Avenue) on Christian Existence in a Marxist Society, drawing on his extensive experiences in West Berlin and East Germany, where he worked to equip the Church to survive in a Communist state. All are welcome to attend this Wednesday afternoon talk.

\*\*\*\*\*

FREEDOM SINGERS HERE SATURDAY  
by David Symington

On Saturday, February 16, at 2:30 p.m., the Freedom Singers, a quintet of Negro students from Albany, Georgia, will perform in the Brubacher Lower Lounge.

This highly talented group has come to the North to publicize what is happening in Albany, Georgia, and to raise funds for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee.

They have, for the time being, forsaken college to donate their talents to the effort for Civil Rights. Each of the members has served some time in jail for his part in sit-ins, Freedom Rides, and demonstrations against segregated facilities; one member has been put in jail not less than 26 times for his activities.

Their talent matches their courage. They come to Albany after starring at a performance in Carnegie Hall on February 1, from which 1500 persons were turned away. The group as a whole was favorably reviewed by Sing Out in an article on "Freedom songs", and Bernice Johnson was singled out by a New York Times reviewer as having a highly successful future ahead of her. Their repertoire consists of "freedom songs", modern ballads based on modern-day incidents that have occurred in the South.

Their presentation is a capella (i.e., without accompaniment), and each selection is introduced with its historical background.

Let's support the Freedom Singers, a group which has had a moving and lasting effect on all those who have heard them.

\*\*\*\*\*

BUY AMERICAN OR ELSE!  
by Tom Bartlow

For several months now "conservatives across the country have been taking part in a program they describe as "the answer to a prayer; it is effective and it is fun." The program is simply to embarrass stores selling products manufactured in Communist countries by placing appropriately (by these so-called conservative standards) printed cards with the merchandise in the stores. For example, we are told that Polish hams are inspected for your table by Communists."

If this project is indeed the answer to prayers of conservatives, it is more by coincidence than by design of the Almighty. Such tactics deny store owners reasonable freedom in selection of merchandise. They seem to deny as do many conservative actions, the possibility that opposing forces can compromise to the benefit of both. They support the emotional "the only good commie is a dead commie" approach to the world situation.

Now, from California, comes word that department store owners there have filed suit against persons who have placed these cards in their store. The owners contend that the cards have caused a substantial drop in both cash customers and those using charge accounts. They ask that the defendants be restrained not only from placing cards in the store but also from making any public pronouncements regarding sale of Communist manufactured merchandise in American stores. The American Civil Liberties Union has filed "friend of the court" briefs for both sides saying that the cards should be taboo but further restriction would ignore the constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech. This trial and its outcome could indeed be interesting.

A SANE M.A. SPEAKS AT STATE

or  
YOU WEREN'T THERE  
By Guy McBride

On Wednesday, February 6, at 3 p.m., Canon Collins of St. Paul's Cathedral in London, Chairman of the British Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and co-Chairman of the European Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, delivered an address at Albany State on the "Alternatives to Nuclear War." Twenty-one persons were present. It is quite remarkable how apathetic the student body at Albany State is to critical issues of our time. The potential destruction of civilization and humanity does not seem to concern us; a four hundred dollar tuition, which obviously impairs, though hardly destroys, our ability to serve mankind, sends us into impassioned histrionics.

Canon Collins bases his philosophy upon what he considers to be a religious interpretation of life. "The only realistic thing we can do," he said, "is to love." While he felt that we would never be clear enough to realize the unlimited potential of Christian love, he felt that our political decisions, however unrealistic or inexpedient they might appear at the time, should be made so that they bring us closer to these unlimited horizons. He asserted in an opinion that is shared by an increasing number of concerned people everywhere (even behind the Iron Curtain) that "Nuclear war is so evil, so contrary to a sensible way of life, that we cannot use it, however good the intent." Historically speaking, war has been the final resort for resolving international tensions; its purpose was rationalized in that it was "preserving a way of life, defending the status quo, or protecting the civilian population." These arguments for war somehow seem less effective in our modern society, where it is now generally recognized that war would not only mean genocide of the opposition, but our own suicide as well.

The Canon advocated two plans by which this holocaust can be averted. First he stated that we should insist upon the gradual establishment of a supra-national authority that would assume the real military and political

responsibility for maintaining world peace. The key words seem to be "gradual" and "real"; gradual, in that such an organization should be wisely and carefully developed; real, in that its authority would supercede that of even the most powerful members, unlike the paper authority of the present day United Nations.

Second, Canon Collins recommended that we take small steps, without waiting for concessions from the Communists, to establish a friendly, trustful atmosphere. Such actions would be similar to President Kennedy's unilateral agreement to abandon underground testing during the recently suspended test ban conferences. Khrushchev, he said, can kill the world's population seven times over; we can do it ten. He stated that we must be willing to gamble by taking the initiative. For, even if Russia should become able to do it eight, while we could still only do it ten, what difference would it make? Once

Canon Collins later commented that he believed, on the basis of personal talks with Premier Khrushchev, that the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States were willing to make concessions for world peace, if they could obtain public support. In commenting on the question of Red China, Canon Collins felt that China should be admitted to the United Nations, because "a quarrelsome person within a family is always more tractable than one without it." His analysis of this situation seemed somewhat less realistic than of others, particularly when it is noted that Red China has never evinced much interest to enter the United Nations. Nevertheless, he felt that "one on the outside always wants to prove that he counts." This might be helpful in understanding the present antipathy of the Chinese Reds towards the Western Powers.

Whether or not one agrees with this blueprint to world peace, Canon Collins' criticisms and analysis of the need for revamping our political thinking remain valid. It is extremely unfortunate that those of us who are so quick to condemn others as being childish, unrealistic, befuddled do-gooders, or "pinkos", are, ourselves, so completely inadequate in solving the problems they present to us.