

# The Graduate Student Advocate

City University of New York

OCTOBER 1991

Volume 3  
Number 2

## MAYBE THEY WROTE YOU A LETTER

41% of students enrolled at the Graduate School received a notice from the Registrar at the end of August, noting that by GSUC guidelines, their "academic progress" was "unsatisfactory." Failure to comply with standards would bar the student from registration for the spring semester. (See Sept. *Advocate* p. 1).

Also in August, about 200 financial aid students received an additional letter from the Financial Aid Office informing them that their awards would not be processed for the fall semester for the same reason. Students expecting their first checks in September were told that they could not be placed on payroll until they met the criteria for good academic standing. Unlike the text of the larger mailing, this letter did not provide a semester to address the problem.

Financial aid recipients, when blocked, face extremely cumbersome procedures to re-classify their status. Students must first meet with their executive officers to clarify the problem. In cases where no problem existed, an executive officer's signature is still required on a Financial Aid form. Dean of Student Affairs Floyd Moreland must then approve the restoration of satisfactory progress before the form is forwarded to Financial Aid. Every two weeks, Financial Aid submits names to payroll. Getting on payroll is a separate process requiring several more weeks.

Many cases involved computer error or out-of-date information. Nevertheless, financial aid payments were delayed by several weeks.

Short-term loans are available for financial aid students. While the normal funding source for these loans has been depleted due to unusually high demand, additional funds are available and the usual \$250 limit has been suspended temporarily. Matthew Schoengood, Director of Financial Aid, attributes the high demand to the double impact of the budget cuts and the recession. Adjuncts and student staff have been cut on a number of campuses.

Schoengood said that students receiving financial aid have always received these letters and that delays in payroll and loan processing are inevitable because many students, faculty, and executive officers were away in August. He also said that many of these cases have been resolved. This year, delays in loan check processing were exacerbated by the CUNY-wide tuition hike, which was not finally determined until the summer. Student loan eligibility is determined in part by tuition costs.

The unsigned letter noting unsatisfactory progress that was sent to 1619 students began: "I am writing to you at this time to alert you to the fact that the executive officer of your program has been notified that as of July 24, 1991

*continues on p. 2*

## The Facts & Fictions: USS Spending Allegations

The storm of controversy surrounding how and on what the USS spent its budget remains to be answered, despite that charges of fiscal irresponsibility were levied against the University Student Senate September 23, stemming from an article that appeared in the *Student Leader*. The bare facts as presented in the daily newspapers were that a fiscal budget of \$424,000 had been nearly used up with a third of the year remaining, upon expenditures including hotel bills and car services. Initial statements made by the central administration of CUNY suggested there was no appearance of violations in USS's spending, only allegations of overspending; though an audit conducted by CUNY's Office of Internal Audit, released October 2, found that \$85,653 of the \$419,000 spent may have violated university spending guidelines.

This audit states the majority of expenditures were permissible within university guidelines. University guidelines, according to the audit, refer to the necessary documentation for all expenditures, per-diem limits for reimbursement of transportation, travel and food expenses, and injunctions against money being spent for what the Board has declared to be impermissible uses of student fees, they do not make judgements, "as to the

worth and wisdom of any expenditures." Purchases of over \$500 must follow competitive bidding requirements; while the audit found that 25 such purchases, totalling \$37,946, were not in compliance. The \$9,000 that was deemed impermissible included \$4,500 for illegal loans made to USS officers and \$4,500 for the legal defense of 5 students. Requests for payment of \$23,419 were submitted without complete justifications, descriptions and explanations, and include items such as car rentals, beepers, walkie talkies, out-of-country travel and printing.

The day after the allegations were made public, Marcia Keiz, the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs, declared her office was going to apply state guidelines for approved expenditures to the USS. These guidelines refer to allowable travel, transportation and meal expenditures. According to Rita Rodin of the CUNY Office of Public Information, the USS was not bound by state spending guidelines for elected officials, prior to this declaration, but rather by the regulations of the Fiscal handbook for the Control and Accountability of Student Activity Fees. State guidelines make explicit that commuting between residence and workplace is not an allowable travel expense.

*continues on p. 8*

## Reynolds Redux: There She Goes Again

At the most recent CUNY Board of Trustee meeting on September 25, Chancellor Reynolds proposed two senior level appointments without conducting affirmative action searches, as revealed by ex-officio Trustee Dr. Robert Picken, the chair of the University Faculty Senate. Dr. Picken protested that the University Report concerning both appointees, Brenda Spatt and Ronald Berkman, states "Affirmative Action report on file" when there were no such affirmative action reports in the actual files for these appointments. Chancellor Reynolds' decision to permanently appoint Dean Berkman explicitly contradicted her statement of intent at a Trustee meeting one year ago that Berkman's appointment was temporary, said Picken.

Dr. Picken directly asked the Chancellor why there had been no affirmative action searches when the University Faculty Senate has repeatedly gone on record stating that senior level administrative appointments should be conducted in the same fashion as faculty appointments that require affirmative action searches. He also added, that as public documents, the University and Chancellor's Reports should accurately state the facts and should not contain misleading implications that affirmative action searches had been made when they had not been.

Chancellor Reynolds responded to Picken that "they are saving a position" by asking Dr. Spatt to add to her existing workload by appointing her to a new position. She had no explanation for why she supported Berkman's appointment to a \$63,900 per year position, other than to state he has assumed a "tremendous load" of work over the past year with the College Preparedness Initiative, a program which has been sponsored by Reynolds herself.

Reynolds then turned over the matter of the potentially misleading phrase, "Affirmative Action report on file," to Vice-Chancellor Bloom. Bloom said that statement can mean

either that there is an Affirmative Action report on file, or instead, that there is "a request and approval of a waiver of the search procedure, which can occur in certain situations." Vice-Chancellor Bloom did not say whether such a waiver had been sought, who may request a waiver, who can approve such a waiver, or what those "certain situations" might be.

Referring to Ronald Berkman's new position, Dr. Picken expressed his long standing disapproval of the large number of such appointments Reynolds has made during her year's tenure as Chancellor. He then read from the minutes of the September 24, 1990 Board of Trustee meeting, where Chancellor Reynolds unambiguously stated that Dean Berkman's temporary position as Acting Assistant for the Dean of Urban Affairs would cease as soon as Dr. Brown, the Dean of Urban Affairs, returned from her temporary position as acting President of Baruch. Dr. Brown has since returned from Baruch and Dr. Picken complained that Berkman's appointment is now being extended rather than dismissed. The Chancellor made no attempt to explain her apparently contradictory behavior, and James Murphy, Chairperson of the board, moved that the public meeting be adjourned and the issue be taken up in executive session.

When the Board emerged from the private session two hours later, Brenda Spatt had been hired as Associate Dean for Executive Search and Evaluation at \$76,226 per year, and Ronald Berkman had been hired as Acting Assistant Dean of Urban Affairs for \$63,902.

The permanent appointment of Ronald Berkman to a lucrative senior level position despite Chancellor Reynolds' previous assurances to the contrary raises serious questions about her accountability and are reminiscent of the controversy surrounding her resignation as Chancellor of the California State University system.

In May of 1990 Ann Reynolds resigned from her position as Chancellor of the CSU system because of controversy that she used her executive control to give herself a pay raise from \$136,248 to \$195,00 and also raised the

*continues on p. 12*

Editorial: A Call for Action	2
Art History Search	3
Art Shows	3
Letters & Commentary	4
Point of View	5
USS Election	6
Delegation to Meet Chancellor	6
Meet the President, part II	7
End of Open Admissions?	10
Arts & Events	11
Classifieds	12
DSC Activities	12

## Get a Letter?

from p. 1

you were not meeting the Graduate School's minimum standards of academic progress, which have been published for many years in the official Bulletin and the Student Handbook." The Doctoral Students Council has already mandated its Steering Committee to draft an open letter to the administration questioning the advisability of issuing these letters. That open letter is printed on page 3 in this issue.

Most students interviewed felt the letter was presumptuous, often inaccurate, and condescending. Rolf Meyersohn, Sociology's Acting Executive Officer, told the *Advocate* he thought the letter was "brutal" and arrogant. The computer search used to generate letters was not supported by a manual screening for error or delays in recording compliance. Meyersohn said that last semester the Sociology department had worked out arrangements with those students who had not made satisfactory progress; those students got letters anyway. Although some executive officers favored the initiative, Meyersohn noted that others felt the letters foster an adversarial relationship between students and administrators.

In November, departments will receive another set of forms. These will be used to determine Spring registration eligibility for students whose cases remain unresolved. Dean Moreland says he will be looking for evidence of progress towards meeting the formal standards.

In a meeting with executive officers, Dean Moreland stated the letters were primarily intended to facilitate greater contact and communication between students and faculty. He noted that a number of letters erroneously went to students who had fulfilled the requirements. Most of these cases had been resolved. He told the *Advocate* that students having problems settling the issue of satisfactory progress can make an appointment with him directly. He expects far fewer letters to be issued next semester because of computer coding improvements and "student progress".

In past years, says Dean Moreland, he was likely to take executive officer signatures as reason enough to approve student standing. This year he is more concerned that meetings actually take place between students, their faculty advisors, and their executive officers. In reviewing some cases, he has asked for more information from the department before approving student status. He says the process is meant to apply enough pressure on students without making them feel threatened; most people receiving warning letters do not present real problems. He is primarily concerned about low GPAs.

Federal law requires that all academic institutions which receive Federal funds establish minimum standards for progress. Dean Moreland stated that Federal officials have not audited the GSUC's compliance for several years.

Still, due to a rumor which circulated last summer, many in the GSUC community think that a State of New York audit of the Graduate Center prompted the August letters. Indeed, according to Moreland, New York State officials notified the Graduate Center that financial aid recipients alone could not be singled out for compliance with academic progress standards. Therefore, a computer search of all student records was initiated. Dean Moreland said that one reason the decision was

made to issue the letters *en masse* was to leave a "paper trail." Any future audits would find that the administration had been diligent in holding students to GSUC guidelines.

The federal government provides guidelines for the implementation of these rules, though the institution concerned retains some autonomy in creating specific expectations. Standards of progress differ from school to school, as do the positions of those who determine "good standing."

In the case of the Graduate School, standards were determined in the mid-'80s by the Executive Council of Presidents. Minimum academic standards at the Graduate School are: a 3.0 GPA; 1st doctoral exam prior to 45 credits of coursework; no more than two outstanding incompletes; meeting all degree requirements within eight years (or in seven if entering with a Masters). Students are expected to comply with the criteria, but executive officers together with the Dean of Student Affairs have final say on whether the student is making satisfactory progress. Financial Aid students have always been closely monitored. This year the recent encoding of all student records enabled the Administration to track academic progress for many more students, generating 3956 searches.

The status of "unsatisfactory progress," in many cases reflects unrecorded grades and individual extenuating circumstances which had already been addressed between students and executive officers.

Changes have been planned, however, in the process of evaluating academic standing. Last year, the Graduate Council, comprised of students, faculty, and administrative appointees, voted to make a change in by-laws. The role that the Office of Student Affairs now plays will be transferred to an academic review panel of faculty, which will minimize Dean Moreland's future involvement in this process. This change is pending approval of President Horowitz and the Board of Trustees. Also, in future semesters, the departments will determine individually whether the executive officers or faculty advisors should evaluate satisfactory academic progress and then send appeals to the new committee for approval.

Perception about the impact and appropriateness of the letters differs drastically between those involved in preparation and those who were the recipients. Faculty advisors have been generally overlooked as contributors to the decision on a student's standing and aid eligibility. Students do not often perceive the initiative as one that is meant to foster greater mentoring from faculty members, but rather as an aggravation which may be slightly ameliorated by an executive officer's intervention against "the computer."

The initiative raises other questions. Are formal standards intended as a guide for faculty assessment of minimum progress? Have these standards become inflexible rules instead? Why have these standards not been adjusted for part-time enrollment, nonacademic responsibilities, differences between programs, and CUNY's inability to support its graduate students financially in the manner of highly-endowed private institutions?

*Pamela Donovan is a doctoral student in Sociology awaiting her first financial aid check.*

## Editorial:

## A Call For Action

Many of students at the Graduate School will find that their lives are radically changed, due to the Administration's issuance of the notorious "letter". During November, a further batch of letters will be sent out to check up on those students who received the previous letter, to see if they've cleaned up their situation. As the DSC Steering Committee notes in their open letter, printed herein, no single administrator will take responsibility for the letter. We are part of a community where decisions are, finally, impersonal, and the function of a bureaucracy.

In an interview with The Advocate, Dean Floyd Moreland outlined the process whereby a student is removed from the blacklist of those who are not in compliance with "standards of progress." The student must first meet with his or her Executive Officer and explain why he or she is "not in compliance" (hence "not in good standing"). The Executive Officer may then make arrangements with the student to ensure that he or she hands in papers to complete classwork. The EO then sends a letter (which, students should note, must have the right "language") to Dean Moreland, who then notifies the registrar to allow the student to register in good standing, and thus be eligible for loans, stipends and other financial aid. The Executive Officer also has the power to dismiss the students explanations, and either allow the student to register "not in good standing", or deny registration altogether.

The Advocate has learned that there are considerable differences in the treatment of students who have the same number of incompletes. One Executive Officer merely required a brief conference with the student in question, while another first asked the student not to register, then presented the student with an "agreement" which stipulated that the student must reduce her number of "incompletes" to the (permissible) two before she would be placed in "good standing". This agreement

requires that the student not only hand in the papers, but that the professors concerned also hand in grades.

In the same interview The Advocate asked Dean Moreland if the August letter was valid although it was unsigned. He answered that, "the letter is still in effect, like any dunning letter." When Moreland then referred to the aforementioned Executive Officer's "agreement", as a "contract", it finally became clear that our administration treats us like clients, more specifically, like delinquent credit card clients. We sign "agreements" and "contracts", and are "dunned" when we do not pay up on time. The corporate pretensions of the Graduate School, where department heads are, after all, Executive Officers, and have been fully incorporated into administrative practice.

Students should not be deceived and believe that this letter is the work of one person, for it must finally be enforced by a system. And this system is comprised of our professors, our executive officers, our deans, our provosts, and finally our president. The Advocate has demonstrated that even if the orders came from Washington, it is up to the Graduate School to decide how the orders are enforced. Punishment has already been meted out to students who were denied registration, or are "not in good standing" and so ineligible for financial aid necessary to pay for rent, tuition, money for meals, books, etc.

Still, we can fight back, and since our administration refuses to treat us equitably as individuals we should respond collectively. Students should refuse to sign contracts, to cut inequitable individual deals, and should insist on their right to due process. One equitable standard for all. In conjunction with the Doctoral Students Council and our various student organizations, we should begin to organize now, to form an ad-hoc committee to negotiate, and pursue constitutionally guaranteed actions. We can't afford to wait until November. ☐

### BOARD OF TRUSTEES ANNUAL BROOKLYN BOROUGH HEARING

THURSDAY OCTOBER 24

5-8 P.M.

Brooklyn Borough Hall  
Court Room  
209 Joralemon Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Persons wishing to speak should notify the Office of the Secretary of the Board of Trustees, (212) 794-5379 by 4 pm on October 18. Speakers are limited to 3 minutes. Written statements are recommended and may be of any length.



## Around & About The Center

### Art History Interviews 4 Finalists for Nochlin Post

Last Spring the Graduate School Art History program solicited applications for an Art Historian (Professor/Assoc. Professor, Tenure) with a specialization in Nineteenth century European Art; "painting, sculpture, and theory preferred." The search committee is comprised of four faculty and one student. The faculty members are Rosalind Krauss, William Gerdts, Rose Carol Wash-ton-Long, and Jack Flam. The student position is shared by Vivian Bobka and Betsy Boone who are also the student representatives on the Executive Committee.

The committee announced four finalists at the beginning of the Fall semester. The finalists are Margaret Nesbitt (Barnard College), Michael Marrinan (Stanford), Anne Higonnet (Wellesley), and Carol Armstrong (Berkeley). Each candidate must give a public lecture as part of the application process. Nesbitt and Marrinan have already lectured, any interested students can hear Higonnet on October 10th, and Armstrong on October 31st. Both lectures will be held at 2:30 p.m. in room LO2.

Distinguished Professor Linda Nochlin, who left the Graduate School for Yale University after the Spring 1990 semester, is the well known author of *Realism* (Penguin, 1971), and in 1988 co-curated an exhibition at the Brooklyn Museum titled *Courbet Reconsidered*. Nochlin is also known as a pre-eminent feminist art historian who has written and lectured extensively on this major issue at important ven-

ues, particularly the annual College Art Association (CAA) meeting. With Thomas B. Hess, Nochlin also wrote *Woman as Sex Object: Studies in Erotic Art* (Newsweek Books, 1972). Prof. Nochlin successfully introduced her concerns into the Graduate School's curriculum and taught courses on women artists and feminism. With Prof. Krauss, and in her capacity as deputy Executive Officer, from 1981 to 1986, Nochlin developed the "Theory and Criticism" track within the Art History program.

Many current students wanted to insure that Nochlin's initiatives would be continued and, according to Executive Officer Rose Carol Wash-ton-Long, encouraged the search committee to select candidates with an interest in feminism. Due to existing commitments none of the candidates would be available to teach until the Fall 1992 semester.

With the latest onslaught of budget cuts and the hiring freeze many departments have been unable to fill vacant central appointments. However, in addition to the loss of Nochlin, Art History recently lost several other members of the doctoral faculty, exacerbating the shortage of course offerings. Prof. Long stated that for this reason the Graduate School administration agreed to fill the central position despite the hiring freeze, while the offices of the President and Provost have provided assistance and paid transportation costs.

### DSC Steering Committee Protests Status Letter

Dear Dean Moreland:

Recently a computer generated letter was sent to over 1600 out of approximately 4000 students, informing them that their academic standing is in jeopardy.

We find ourselves deeply perplexed by the lack of concern this Administration demonstrates for its students by communicating with us via this letter in a manner both careless and threatening. Your mass-produced rebuke glibly dismisses students who have devoted years to their academic pursuits, when it tells them that they are free to determine the letter's cause by choosing, menu-style, "One from Column A." At the same time, the tone of the letter manages to be both urgent and final: "...failure to achieve the College's minimum standards of progress will result in your being barred from registration for the spring semester of 1992."

Nowhere in the letter is there any indication that this may not have been totally the students' fault. On an obvious level, there is a range of reasons, from computer or administrative errors to departmental policies (which encourage students to delay certain exams), that renders a good number of the letters immediately invalid. Hardly less obvious, and much more pervasive, is the existence of extenuating circumstances that frequently capsize even the strongest academic career. Nowhere in the letter is there the slightest recognition that such circumstances are a major part of the problem.

Students, deeply concerned about incompletes, strive to eliminate them, but find themselves ensnared in a Catch-22 scenario. Many of us who live in this very expensive city and who receive meager, if any, financial support in pursuit of our degrees, work two or three jobs to attempt to meet our basic needs. Heavy work or teaching schedules, necessary for both economic and academic survival, demand most of our time.

Rather than assisting us with these difficulties, the Graduate Center often treats us like outsiders who could be dispensed without much fanfare. This unsigned letter from the registrar is as yet the most blatant example of this attitude.

Your disregard for the various reasons for a student's "poor" academic standing, or even worse, your desire to ignore those

reasons for the sake of expediency, is exactly the approach a Dean of Students should not take.

There is a larger issue, however. The fact that extenuating circumstances affect such a great number of our students is evidence that the problem lies in the structure of the Graduate Center, not in individual failure. There is something institutionally unsound about a place where 40 percent of the students are in "academic trouble." The remedy rests in fixing the structure, not in blaming the students. Failure to recognize this reality will only perpetuate the current situation and will eventually lead to an even more closed, more homogeneous, and more static scholarly center.

It is not too late. A sincere *mea culpa* would be greatly appreciated. And we would like the guarantee that, from now on, in all aspects of administrative policy, students will not only be considered as individuals whose situations vary greatly, whose lives are complex, and whose membership in this academic community is equally important and as deserving of respect as yours and any other administrator's, but also, students will be consulted and included in the creation of all policy.

We also request the following: (1) that the threat to bar students from Spring, 1992 registration be withdrawn; (2) that a procedure be established so that students can find out from the registrar precisely what triggered this letter (several departments are unclear as to its cause); and (3) that a method be set up for students to appeal the decisions of the computer.

Sincerely,  
Steering Committee  
The Doctoral Students' Council

### Art in Public Places: Two Exhibitions open at the Graduate School

#### *Images of Blacks in Motion Pictures*

For the past two weeks passersby and members of the Graduate School community have noticed the exhibition of film posters in the mall. The posters are the primary feature of the new exhibition, "Images of Blacks in Motion Pictures". The exhibition also includes a film series (look for the screening times in *The Advocate*) and a music program comprised of selections from the soundtracks for, amongst others, *Carmen Jones*, *Straight Up No Chaser*, *Black Orpheus*, and *The Harder They Come*. The exhibition formally opened on September 25th with a gala reception, which was attended by over 300 guests and hosted by the President of the Graduate School, Frances Degen Horowitz.

The posters span 70 years of the involvement of and representation of African Americans in cinema and include obscure black cast westerns and gangster movies from the '20s as well as "blaxploitation" films from the '70s, such as the *Shaft* series. Some of the representations are denigrating ones such as Steppin Fetchit, while others are more positive and assertive images from films by young African American filmmakers such as Spike Lee and Robert Townsend.

The posters are from the collection of Edward C. Mapp, professor of speech and communication at the Borough of Manhattan Community College. A GSUC press release notes that Prof. Mapp is a member of the New York City Human Rights Commission and "the author and editor of several books including, *Directory of Blacks in Performing Arts* and *Blacks in American Films: Today and Yesterday*." According to Ray Ring, Director of Building Design, the late President of the Graduate School, Harold Proshansky saw Prof. Mapp's collection several years ago and suggested the

current exhibition.

The exhibition will close on November 19th, 1991.

#### *All Grown Up*

On the evening of October 4th a new exhibition opened in the Mina Rees Library in conjunction with the Graduate School's Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies. The exhibition, *All Grown Up*, is curated by Cindy Smith and Liz Dalton (Ph.D program in English), and includes visual works in mixed media well as texts. The texts are statements by teenage witnesses which were read before the NYC Board of Education in support of condom distribution in this city's public schools.

While the texts address the politics of teenage sexuality and AIDS, the visual works examine gay and lesbian sexual identity as a construction formed in part by the artist and the viewer, particularly the viewer-as-State. This is clear in David Bussell's (Ph.D. program in Comparative Literature) piece which bears the chilling imperatives of "Stop" and "Go", as well as in Daphne Fitzpatrick's drawing which suggests a penis. The lesbian collective, *Fierce Pussy* returns to the issue of child sexuality with their conjunction of what the curators define as "grown up words" and the depiction of small children. Other participating artists include Simon Leung (who performed at the Graduate School last May), Clarke Schorr, Ken Day, and Cynthia Madansky. Though several members of the Graduate School community have praised the content and political engagement of the exhibition, Ray Ring confirmed that one "department head" was upset and complained that the exhibition was "one sided". Stay tuned. *All Grown Up* will close on November 1st.

### PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR A CONFERENCE ON RACISM

CUNY GRAD CENTER, OCTOBER 17TH  
6:30 PM ROOM 539

### THE BLACK STUDENT ALLIANCE

IN ASSOCIATION WITH HARLEM VALLEY CHURCHES, SOCIETY FOR CONSERVATION OF JUDAISM, COMMITTEE AGAINST ANTI-ASIAN VIOLENCE, KOREANS FOR SOCIAL CHANGE, ASIAN AMERICANS FOR EQUALITY, DOCTORAL STUDENTS COUNCIL, AELLA, ARAB ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE, COMMITTEE FOR SOCIAL CHANGE, ASIAN AMERICAN CENTER, QUEENS COLLEGE, DR. STANLEY ARONOWITZ, DR. FRANK KIRKLAND, DR. WILLIAM KORNBLUM, DR. JUAN FLORES, DR. CELIA ALVAREZ  
PLEASE NOTE ROOM CHANGE

# Letters & Commentary

## Congratulations, "Sister" Clare

To the Editor:

I rarely respond to articles or speeches of "pro-lifer's", in part because I respond with vehement emotions, and in part because as a person who is also pro-life, I find it difficult to dispute any pro-life stance in a world so dismissive of "humanity".

I respond emotionally because I worked in Colombia in Public Health, and was invariably confronted with a major cause of death: poorly done self-abortions. Right or wrong, families, men and women, are going to control fecundity. They always have. What I remember most vividly are not the screams or moans of pain; nor the facial coloring (grey-green); nor the sobbing of the children when a mother died from a botched abortion, but the odors. The hot heavy smell of blood which never seemed to stop, and the putrid stink of infection still permeate my senses and cause a visceral reaction. In Colombia, one of the "best" methods, recommended by other women, involves taking a large bottle of Coke, leaving it in the sun to heat, shaking it well, and inserting it through the cervix into the uterus.

I would like to suggest to Stephen Clare, and others who seem to believe that this is an easy question, that he, and those who agree with him, step out of the facile attack on "liberals" and ponder the real dilemmas. Who is going to feed, house, educate, nurse that child? Where is

*continues on p. 9*

## My Heart in my Throat

To the Editors:

I read with great interest your recent edition of *The Advocate* in the vain hope that the hostilities of last spring were behind us. I had hoped the summer would heal the wounds we inflicted upon one another, and make it possible for us to pursue our common academic goals as well as our individual political beliefs. Alas, I now see the naivete of my viewpoint.

I was shocked at the personal attack levied against Mr. McClintock by both the editors, and Mr. Hayes' reBUTTAL; indeed, it was the ugly tone of these assaults that compelled me to respond. If as Mr. Hayes asserts there is a phobia to be addressed it seems to be the response of the occupiers whenever anyone dares to criticize their methods. The occupation failed to bring about the goals that the strikers claimed to be striking for: tuition has been increased and budgets have been cut. It seems appropriate to raise questions about the occupation without being subjected to such vitriol.

*continues on p. 9*

## Be Careful with Words

To the editor:

Jarrold Hayes irresponsibly misrepresents my thinking when in his Sept 6 *Advocate* article he excerpts out of context a passage from an article I wrote that was published in the student newspaper *ETCETERAS*. He states that text from my article and two others published in *ETCETERAS* "if not homophobic in themselves, reveal a similar panic in the face of potential empowerment of queers." Let me present the items that Mr. Hayes misread and distorted in his highly misleading excerpt.

In my article I criticized the building occupiers' tactic of speaking out on a variety of issues during the daily speechmaking sessions. I suggested that this "linking" of issues diluted the protest's focus and made it appear, in the eyes of many, to be less than serious. I wrote: "For example, one woman, presumably lesbian, used her turn at the mike to speak stridently about lesbian issues and of a 'liberated Graduate School.' Linkage of issues can be a great way to get the most bang out of your protest buck—if and when the side with whom you're negotiating is affected by your fundamental bargaining chip, which was, in this case, the building."

Mr. Hayes takes this passage and uses

## Bashing Criticism

To the editor:

I would like to criticize the three attacks upon my friend George McClintock in the last issue of the *Advocate*. I found these irresponsible.

First, very quickly, Simon's attack on George in his otherwise excellent rebuttal of Mark Goldblatt. To call *Etceteras* George's "private vanity rag"; his "latest folly" is gratuitous and insensitive. Why bash George in a rebuttal to an article written for the *Advocate*? It also implies that George's editorship of the *Advocate* was foolish as well. George fought hard for free speech at the Grad Center. He put out a good paper; a paper I was proud to write for. Please don't reduce that hard work to "folly."

Jarrold Hayes has written excellent articles for the *Advocate*: under George's regime as well as for the present editorial board. But his "REBUTTAL" to George's "Empowering Cronies" is illogical and conspiratorial. Let us turn to the two sets of premises Jarrod uses to vilify George:

- A. 1. George is against *increasing* the student fee because the chartered organizations it finances serve only 10% of the students.
2. Many of the chartered organizations serve minority and marginalized groups such as African-Americans, women, gays, lesbians and bi-

it build a case for homophobic panic. He could have more accurately reflected my feelings and allowed readers to infer my position on queer/lesbian empowerment had he included in his excerpt another sentence from my original paragraph: "*I criticize the tactic of linkage, though I was in full agreement with what the 'linkers' had to say*" (italics added). As even a casual reader would conclude, my comments centered on the protesters' tactics, not their politics, especially since I state explicitly that "*I was in full agreement with what the linkers had to say.*" So I would ask Mr. Hayes: if a lesbian woman is speaking about empowerment, and I state that I agree with what she (and others) had to say, how can you find in my statements homophobia and empowerment panic? That Mr. Hayes would find in my paragraph anti-queer/lesbian sentiment suggests that either he didn't read my entire article or else he recklessly disregarded those portions which contradicted his contention.

Mr. Hayes also finds in my criticism of linkage attempts by me to somehow undermine the protesters. He writes "As if lesbian strikers/linkers could separate their struggle against homophobia and their struggle for educational rights. As if activists must separate their 'causes' into clear and distinct categories that in no way overlap. This is an example of the traditional tactic of divide and conquer."

*continues on p. 9*

sexuals.

B

1. Many of the writers for *Etceteras* were anti-strike [because it was largely conservatives that responded to George's call for articles. Besides Stanley and myself, many other occupation-supporters sadly declined to debate the issues in *Etceteras*, for the benefit of the larger community].

2. Three of the articles allegedly implied homophobia [in ways that Jarrod does not adequately spell out or prove. Of the three passages cited, only Roman's contained a taint of homophobia. Evan Stark's animus toward issue-linkage,

*continues on p. 11*

## Nothing Short of Totalitarian

To the Editors:

Jarrold Hayes's rebuttal of Mr. McClintock's, "Empowering Cronies," in the September issue of the Graduate Student Advocate, is a thinly veiled attack on *ETCETERAS*, a publication produced by Mr. McClintock at his own expense.

In "Empowering Cronies" Mr. McClintock rightfully states that only a small percentage of students at the Graduate Center take advantage of facilities provided by the DSC such as discounts in the NYPL, the travel fund and the chartered organizations. Mr. Hayes attacks Mr. McClintock for being anti-community and anti the student organizations that serve to empower traditionally disempowered and oppressed communities and to strengthen community bonds. Having been active in the International Student Association, (which constitutes a minority group, maybe not an oppressed one), for the past four years I can say that very few students

*continues on p. 9*

## Rules & Recommendations

To the editor:

As much as I favor giving preference to CUNY doctoral students, I think it is important to correct a misstatement in the September *Advocate* concerning the hiring of adjuncts at CUNY colleges. The notice in question conflated rules about hiring Graduate Assistants (Grad A & B lines) with recommendations about hiring adjuncts. In the course of six years as a department head I had ample reason to learn about the important distinction between the two.

*continues on p. 9*

## Retraction

In the September issue of the *Advocate* we mistakenly said that the vote of the chair of the United Student Senate who is the student trustee to the Board of Trustees, as an ex-officio member, does not count. The vote of the student trustee is counted.

The *Advocate* staff also regrets the potentially racist connotations of the headline "Livin' Large," of the Student Leader's September 23 publication. We apologize for any offense taken. We contributed reportage to the article, distributed 1,000 copies, subscribe to the Student Leader News Service, and support their work as a progressive student news service.

## Attention All Writers!!

The *Advocate* welcomes all letters and article submissions. Letters should be brief. The *Advocate* will withhold the identity of letter writers if requested, though all letters must be signed. Articles should be single spaced, no longer than 2500 words, and submitted on both paper and computer disk if possible. The editors reserve the right to refuse and edit all submissions.

## Advertise in The Advocate!!

Fees are:  
\$50 per quarter page

All Graduate Center student groups, and offices which provide free services to students may place a quarter page advertisement, notice, or announcement free of charge in each issue of *The Advocate*.

for further information  
Call 642-2852 or visit our office in room SC18

## The Graduate Student Advocate

The Graduate School and University Center  
of the City University of New York  
33 West 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10036  
Student Center 18  
Telephone: 212-642-2852

## Contributors

G. Gantor  
Gavin Macaulay

Andrew Long, Editor  
Tara McGann, Managing Editor  
Thomas Burgess, Associate Editor  
Michael Waldron, Associate Editor  
Pamela Donovan, Contributing Editor  
Ron Hayduk, Contributing Editor  
Jarrod Hayes, Contributing Editor  
Jonathan Lang, Contributing Editor  
Vincent Tirelli, Contributing Editor

The opinions expressed in *The Graduate Student Advocate* are those of the individual contributors and in no way reflect the opinions of the Doctoral Students' Council, its officials or its representatives.



## POV

## Points of View

## POV

## Films Reviewed: Or Replay it Again, Sam

There was a movie around this summer, *Regarding Henry*. In the usual female response, I was drawn in on account of its leading man, Harrison Ford. I had expected a tear-jerker and was surprised to find myself unmoved at the end or at any point along the way there. I think my lack of reaction came from my feeling that the movie really should have been called *When Bad Things Happen to Rich People*. There was, however, one interesting premise, namely, *Getting to do it all over again* — "it" referring to "life" or any of those things one would like to do over. For a crucial minute or two, the brain of the horrible Henry, of the title is deprived of blood or oxygen or whatever (he's been shot), with the result that his memory is absolutely wiped clean. Thus, like a baby goose deprived of its mother, Henry in his rehabilitation bonds with the first object in sight, which happens to be a jolly, caring black man. (They're all around us these — caring men!) Instead of reverting in his recov-

ery into nasty old lawyer Henry, he turns into a decent guy.

I had long stopped thinking about all this when a truly involving movie appeared that resurrected the possibility of getting to do it all over again — and getting it right the second time around: *Dead Again*. It took me about half of the film to catch on since reincarnation is not a subject I'd ever thought much about before; while being entertained by the switching back and forth between the present story and the past one, I kept thinking there would be some explanation for poor Grace's nightmares (something rational, for goodness' sake, like a heinous brain-washing experiment à la *Manchurian Candidate*). But, no, as pointed out by Dr. Cozy Carlisle, one of the quirkier characters in the movie, the past is an implicating kind of place. (Or, in a memorable line about the karmic credit plan: "Buy now, pay forever.")

At the beginning of this movie, Roman Strauss, on the way to the electric chair for

Points of View, a new feature in The Advocate, is a forum for unsolicited submissions. The ideas and arguments expressed herein are those of the authors alone, although submissions may be edited for clarity and brevity.

one is 21," the age at which I first entered graduate school and failed pretty sensationally for want of trying.

Now that I've officially arrived at level 3 in my doctoral career, I sometimes even imagine that this time around I'm getting things right as well. Then I remember that twenty years ago in graduate school we all felt we were on the brink of getting things right — the relations between the sexes, poverty, war, all social evils. Such are the topics on my mind as the beginning of the school year rolls around again, for I have this strange sense of déjà vu as new (and even younger) faces seek to get things right too. Welcome to Academia!

Elizabeth Powers, Ph.D. program in Germanic Languages & Literatures.

## Don't Let Strangers In

It's already been two years or more since I applied for admission into the Ph.D. program in Comparative Literature and was rejected. Evidently my Master's diploma from the University of Gdansk didn't fit with the high expectations of the mighty executive officer of the program. In general I was told my literacy was insufficient for the Comparative Literature program and I should check out the Liberal Studies department. This meant going for the Master's again, but I already understood that my degree from Poland was not as good as the one offered by the Graduate Center. I did go to the Liberal Studies department and after some time I was rejected. "We have Ph.D. students in our courses," I was told, "Are you sure you will be able to follow?" My education, erudition and experience was questioned again. The whole conversation was based on: prove to us you are not an idiot. It was too much for me to bear.

Since then many things have happened in my life, a few miseries and a few successes as well. One of them, perhaps the most important was that I have been admitted to the Liberal Studies program: I have been allowed to study in the semi-divine environment of the Graduate School. The place I had for so long been refused entry.

Here is what I've learned in the first four weeks: The GC has developed a very specific sense of fairness. Cases of racism, sexism and homophobia should be addressed, but simple ignorance doesn't count as a crime. Students (whatever their degrees) don't know basic facts from the history of human development, but it doesn't seem to bother anyone. A student saying: "I'm a lesbian poet, but I haven't heard about Sappho in my whole life" is not perplexed by this very fact, and neither is anyone around. When we create the future, we have no time to think where we came from, n'est-ce pas? Once you are admitted, the pedagogical body will stand on their heads to made you feel comfort-

able. You don't know about Sappho, but you are taking a Women's Studies course? Don't worry, she's just a white, middle class Greek and she died so long ago.

We can pretend to be whatever we choose. We can pretend to be the Best University in the World, the one that gives you the most profound education. But adding extra pain to somebody's life because we want to pretend we are what we aren't is unethical at the least.

In the first weeks of my study at the Graduate Center I have found out that the image created for me in my conversations with executive officers of departments is the reverse of how things in reality are. Did I have to be rejected in order to have their self-esteem improved? Or did they really expect me, with my good old-fashioned Eastern European education to be less than capable of following their course of study? I imagine they thought: "If our own pure American students don't know about Sappho, what could she know?" We will never find out what they really thought, but every time I see a student being comforted by a teacher because she happened not to know something obviously basic, it gives me a real, vicious pleasure. I don't want to blame students for being so comfortable with what they know or don't know. It is at least as important as feeling good in one's own body. I also understand that in different cultures, certain types of learning are supported more than other ones. I understand you don't need to know Sappho in order to become a lesbian poet, a woman poet, a poet, or a graduate student, or a good or bad American. But I blame the system that has built a tangible facade to cover its flaws. And I believe that a sign should be posted in front of the Graduate Center: "Don't let strangers in, unless they won't recognize our weaknesses!"

Izabela Filipiak, Masters program in Liberal Studies

## The Foreign (European Only) Language Institute

The following is a commentary on the Foreign Language Institute of the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. It is derived from the introductory text (cited below in italics) on page three of the FLI's information brochure. This author's commentary follows each citation.

*The Foreign Language Institute, located at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York in midtown Manhattan, offers a number of non-credit courses each Fall, Spring, and Summer to meet the needs of individuals and of the professional, business, and academic communities in New York City.*

Provided those individuals are only interested in European languages. Those interested in learning Asian or African languages can kindly hit the road.

*Its small classes, carefully structured curricula and methods, experienced instructors, and convenient location make the Graduate Center's Foreign Language Institute unique.*

However, its Eurocentric bias and attention to only those CUNY students interested in European languages and culture, while excluding and failing to provide services to those CUNY students interested in African and Asian languages, is only too typical.

*Located at 33 West 42nd Street, the Graduate Center is the headquarters for the Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York. The Center's facilities include a library, classrooms and seminar rooms, an auditorium, and a dining commons and lounge on the 18th floor. The street-level pedestrian mall is the site for art exhibits year-round and for lunch hour concerts in the summer months.*

The Graduate Center is also where one will find the kind of Eurocentric curricula favored by ethnocentric old fossils like Alan Bloom, but where one will not be able to find graduate students of African or Asian literature and languages engaged in the same opportunities for learning as those favored by the Foreign Language Institute's Eurocentrism and ethnochau-

vinism.

*The Fall term of the Foreign Language Institute is in session from September through December.*

During which time there will be no study of African or Asian languages permitted. Only nice, familiar, comfortable European languages will be offered for study.

*The courses in reading knowledge are designed to assist graduate students, professionals, business people in acquiring and/or strengthening a reading knowledge of an European language.*

The are not designed to assist graduate students, professionals and business people in acquiring and/or strengthening a reading knowledge of an African or Asian language. Such individuals can go to Hell. After all, what could possibly be of interest in African or Asian languages worth reading?

*The approach in these courses is traditional and grammatical.*

It is also Eurocentric, ethnocentric, racist, and discriminatory.

*Courses in which the language is spoken (indicated with an asterisk) are also scheduled for the Fall, as noted below in these course listings.*

Of course, none of these classes will include African or Asian languages, as the Foreign Language Institute is only interested in letting European languages be heard, while silencing African and Asian languages.

*For further information, please call (212) 642-2912 between 10 a.m. and 5 a.m. any business day; or come to our office, located in Suite 300, on the third floor, of 25 West 43rd Street, directly opposite the main Graduate Center building.*

But if you do call or visit, make damn sure you only speak one of the six holy European languages. If you're interested in an African or Asian language, kindly get the fuck out of the country!

Michael Mueller, Ph.D program in Anthropology.

## How the USS Spends Our Money: Signed by CUNY Central

The process whereby a USS expenditure becomes a check endorsed by the CUNY Research Foundation involves many steps. As described in a report made to the Chancellor on October 2, the USS chair submits a formal request to the Office of Student Affairs, who must approve the expenditure before it can be sent to the Research Foundation. Vice-Chancellor Jay Hirshenson said the administrators who approved the expenditures were, "Generally speaking LeMelle or Jefferson." LeMelle was the former Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs. Jefferson is the Dean of Student Affairs. Once authorized by the Office of Student Affairs, the request for a check is then sent to the CUNY Research Foundation.

Aston Greene, who has a salaried position in the USS as College Community Liason, described the process in more detail. Each request, according to Greene gets 5 signatures. After the request leaves the Office of Student Affairs, it is sent up to Vice-Chancellor Hirshenson for his signature. The request then travels to the Accounts Payable department within the Research Foundation at 79 5th Ave.. The Office of Purchasing then reviews the request to see if there is proper documentation, if necessary bids were submitted, and that minutes of USS meetings are in order. If everything is deemed in order, the check then gets cut and endorsed by Paul Siegal, the Executive Vice-President for the Foundation, who endorses all checks, according to Greene.

But according to CUNY's own internal audit, checks were written for expenditures with improper documentation, for which bids had not been submitted and for expenditures deemed improper. CUNY's internal audit says \$85,653 of \$419,000 spent may fall outside of purchasing guidelines.

It would appear that USS's expenditures are receiving far more scrutiny now than when requests passed over desks several months ago. "Tom Facciolo had indicated [in the spring] that the USS had not violated any University, city or state guidelines," stressed Aston Greene, about the Vice-President of the CUNY Research Foundation.


The budget of the University Student Senate comes from student activity fees. CUNY's 200,000 student body pays \$.85 each for the administration and operation of the University Student Senate, the rest of the budget is supplemented by the university. Marcia Keiz, Vice-Chancellor

for Student Affairs, in her report to the Chancellor, said the USS budget is usually between \$300,000 and \$400,000. The 1991 budget was \$425,000 due to a balance of \$80,000 carried into the 1991 fiscal year. Top CUNY administrator, Jay Hirshenson described the role of the City University towards the USS as that of a collection agent for the fees. He added, "We don't deal with the wisdom or worth of a particular expenditure," saying it is up to the University Student Senate to, "determine how the money should be spent." After collecting and distributing student activity fees, the responsibility of the CUNY administration is only to see that spending conforms to approved budget practice and that money is not spent illegally, says Hirshenson.

While the central CUNY administration does not comment upon "the value or worth" of the USS's spending, the internal audit also said that all expenditures reviewed were given the approval by the Office of Student Affairs. But if the administration doesn't comment upon how the money is spent, it certainly keeps a running tally.

In March of this year, the former Vice Chair for Fiscal Affairs, Tilden LeMelle, sent a memo to the USS warning them that with, "approximately 10 months remaining in the budget year, the Senate [had] expended nearly two-thirds of its budget."

The administration, specifically the Office of Student Affairs, had a record of all line-item expenditures of the USS. The list of expenditures that was leaked to the Student Leader by Rafael Alvarez, and was the basis of the articles that appeared in the daily papers came from the assistant to the Dean of Student Affairs.

The USS budget for 1991 was approved by the full Senate on February 3. Subsequent adjustments can be made by the Steering Committee, but have to be ratified by the full Senate, according to the by-laws which govern the USS. During the spring, the USS often did not have a quorum at its meetings, and so budgetary decisions were not approved by the full senate. Both LaMarre and the internal audit criticized the former Vice-Chair for Fiscal Affairs, Rafael Alvarez, for not making budget reports to the Senate and CUNY administration. Alvarez has charged that the Chair and several members of the steering committee blocked him from gaining access to this information, and that it took him months to finally get the expenditures from the Office of Student Affairs. Aston Greene countered that the expenditures are public information, and that any CUNY student could have gotten them. The Advocate was not able to contact Alvarez despite repeated attempts. 

Tara McGann

## Graduate School Student Delegation Prepares to Meet the Chancellor


On September 23rd a group of nine students from the Doctoral Students' Council met with the Graduate School President Frances Degen Horowitz, to discuss a future meeting with CUNY Chancellor, W. Ann Reynolds. The meeting was also attended by Dean Floyd Moreland and Steve Gorelick, Special Assistant to the President.

The student group included Michael Glassman (DSC), Gordon Crandall (DSC), Joanna Sharf (DSC & FSO.), Gillian Harper (SER), Steve Thompson (BSA), Andrew Long (Advocate), Mun Wong (DSC & OLGBC), Prateek Patnaik (ISO), and William Newbery (AELLA). President Horowitz noted with surprise the deliberate inclusion of representatives from the student groups and organizations within the student community though outside the electoral confines of the DSC. This observation appeared to be mediated by recent CUNY politics. During the strike, and now, in the aftermath, the Chancellor and campus administrations have refused to negotiate with strike committees. They have repeatedly stated that they will only negotiate or meet with the elected student governments.

The proposed meeting with the Chancellor came about when SER protested Ann Reynolds' May appearance at an annual award ceremony which was broadcast on CUNYTV. The Chancellor told two members of SER that she would meet with Graduate Center students if the DSC formally invited her. Within days Michael Glassman (Co-chair for Communications) wrote to the Chancellor to request such a meeting. The Chancellor's office responded on June 4th and asked that the meeting be delayed until the new president was "in place".

At the preliminary meeting with President Horowitz the student delegates presented nine concerns and topics for discussion with the Chancellor. The topics are: child care for GSUC students, the status of CUNY adjuncts, time limits for graduate degrees, sexual harassment policies, recruitment of minority students and faculty, new Ph.D programs, improved support of international students, health care and insurance coverage, student involvement in the budget process and CUNY-wide initiatives. All of the students spoke eloquently on behalf of their organizations. Prateek Patnaik was particularly well prepared and presented startling statistics to boost his argument on behalf of the financially and politically beleaguered international students at both the Graduate School and at other CUNY campuses.

Several students also reiterated concerns heard during the recent strike, particularly criticism of the GSUC governmental structure which limits student participation in the decision-making process. William Newbery pointedly remarked that though he is over forty years old the institutional structure of the Graduate School treats him like a teenager.

The President's office has requested a 1 1/2 hour meeting with the Chancellor though the date has yet to be determined. At presstime the Chancellor has not scheduled similar meetings with the other CUNY student governments. 

Andrew Long

## Controversy Surrounds LaMarre Reelection

Jean LaMarre was reelected as Chair of the University Student Senate last Sunday, in a vote that critics charge was fraught with irregularities.

LaMarre was elected on the third ballot by 19 to 17 votes. The first round eliminated a second challenger from City College, the second round was 18 to 18.

After the election of the Chair, the Senators began elections for the Vice-Chair positions. Don Passantino, the current Vice-Chair for Disabled Students, and a supporter of LaMarre, was reelected unopposed. The Vice-Chairs for Fiscal Affairs, Legislative Affairs, and Graduate Affairs all went to Senators who has voted against LaMarre. The new Vice-Chair for Graduate Affairs is Michael Yomi, from the Graduate Center.


The meeting was forced to adjourn when LaMarre and his supporters began to leave the room, thereby taking away the quorum necessary to continue the elections for the other three Vice-Chair positions. LaMarre spoke privately to each of his supporters, says Yomi, and soon after they began to file out of the room. Yomi contends they left the meeting in a block in order to halt the election of a steering committee opposing LaMarre. The eight Vice-Chairs comprise the steering committee.

LaMarre squeaked by Kim Ray from Hunter College by one vote. The Student Leader reports the vote was originally counted at 17 to 18, one vote short of the earlier ballots and one shy of a majority. At that moment a ballot was found from underneath a pad of paper, several inches away from where the rest of the ballots were

piled. That ballot was for Jean LaMarre and tipped the vote 17 to 19.

Students questioning what had happened, demanded a recount of the vote, which confirmed 19 votes for LaMarre, 17 for Ray. Kim Ray, a vocal critic of LaMarre, is active with the United CUNY Federation, a CUNY-wide advocacy group, and is a member of the Hunter Day Student Government.

The election was conducted by a former USS Chair, who was assisted by Liz LaMarre and Aston Greene, salaried USS employees. At press time students opposing LaMarre questioned the legitimacy of the Chair's election due to this and other alleged irregularities. Yomi says several people approached him to lobby for LaMarre after the point when according to USS regulations, no more lobbying is allowed to occur. After all non-delegates were instructed to leave the room, a signed note telling Yomi to vote for LaMarre was passed to him, from a LaMarre supporter outside of the room; this note had gone past the guards at the door.

The elections were held at the CUNY Law School rather than at E. 80th Street where USS meetings have always been held. This order was made by the Office of Student Affairs, according to university spokesperson Rita Rodin, to encourage the USS to hold its meetings on different campuses. The prior meeting of the USS held three weekends ago was at E. 80th Street. A Senator, who will not go on record, alleged that there was concern amongst the administration of what students might do if LaMarre was reelected. 

## Cultural Studies General Meeting

Friday, 18 October  
at 11:00 AM

Grace Building  
Room 1502



## Meet the President:

An interview with Frances Degan Horowitz, part II

On July 17th, The Advocate met with our newly appointed president. The first portion of the resulting interview was printed in the September issue. The interview continues below.

**Advocate:** We heard that you actually were very pro-student in your orientation, specifically helping to facilitate students who have different interests, to actually get their interests expressed in the recognizable form of the Ph.D. Could you talk a little bit about some of the innovations that you hope to bring about?

**Horowitz:** Well, I don't want to take credit for things, for instance there is a special studies Ph.D. [at K.U.] that was already in place when I became Dean of the Graduate School. I didn't make that happen. What I probably did was to make that an accessible route. Special studies and other interdisciplinary degrees are often set up as a result of certain kinds of pressures that not everyone else would fall into. My contribution was to knock the barriers down.

**A:** Could you say what the special studies Ph.D. is, because here at CUNY we have an individualized bachelors degree in which students are able, when they get the support of at least two mentors, to develop an individualized program. Here, at the Graduate Center, I thought many years ago, at least for my own interests which didn't fit that well within the Philosophy program, that an individual Ph.D. program would be interesting. But the registrar says that New York State requires what is called a higher education code. And so here we have a trial period for interdisciplinary concentrations. This is an attempt to float the possibility of doing more individualized work, and then to test whether there is a sufficient interest to make this into a Ph.D. program. How does that relate to the special studies Ph.D.?

**H:** Yes, it's a little bit like it. The special studies Ph.D. at Kansas is designed to enable students who are already enrolled in one of the existing programs, to put together a program that comes out of interests that can't be satisfied by that program. So for example, we didn't have a Ph.D. in the child language area. But we had a superb Linguistics department and a very strong Speech and Hearing Pathology department and a strong Child Development Program. And so one student might say, "I want to do child language. Here is the committee I would like to have and this is the course of study." So she makes the proposal and the committee signs on and it goes to a special studies brief committee which says, "Could she do this in any existing program?" If the answer is yes, it is denied. If the answer is no... and it is academically respectable, meets certain standards and criteria, and so on and so forth, and are her academic standards are good enough...? If the answer is yes on all of those, then she is a special Ph.D. student and she proceeds to get her special Ph.D. in child language. Now naturally, that became a model, so we now have a regular Ph.D. in child language. It gained so much interest, the faculty were interested and they came forward with a new Ph.D. program that was really beyond the point of a special studies model. Like most universities we had to go through an approval process and ultimately the Board had to approve it. Now, we have received other special studies proposals that meet all those criteria, but which never became new Ph.D. programs. We had one a number of years ago in the neuro-sciences. The student put things together from chemistry and developmental biology and so on. That never became a new Ph.D. program.

**A:** So is there a waiver of existing requirements?

**H:** No, the degree program has to meet all the requirements. That is a comprehensive, orals and a dissertation and so on. For a Ph.D., (and we don't have that many special studies Ph.D.'s), we don't worry about teaching requirements. Maybe that is because of the way Kansas is. But we ultimately have to record everything that we teach. The student has a special committee, and that committee is responsible for the student.

**A:** That sounds interesting. One of the problems here is that if a student at CUNY falls outside of the discipline's mainstream, there is a subsequent lack of financial support which makes that kind of creative approach especially difficult.

**H:** Well, that is always true. But very often the special studies Ph.D. students put together something from Political Science, History and Sociology. Some of them may offer a grant, followed by a research grant. Having special study status does not necessarily put you out of the mainstream. But it could, depending on what you put together.

**A:** Well, this brings up another question. What ideas do you have for curriculum development at this Graduate School? I should give you a little bit of history and perhaps mention one particular case. During the budget crisis President Proshansky imposed a freeze on new Ph.D. programs. About six proposals are just sitting there, waiting for consideration. Actually Provost Marshall spoke to a deputation from Students for Educational Rights about this freeze—it was one of the demands of the strike committee. So this imposition, which I personally think was wrong, was blamed on budget cuts which are external to the Graduate School committee on degrees and curriculum. These measures should not have prevented people who have this interest from preparing their new Ph.D. proposals. Second, the general question regarding the institution of new programs is, perhaps, an Art History question too. Would you consider rearranging existing programs? I have made a suggestion to some people, that we combine the language programs but eliminate the Executive Officers. Instead of separate Comparative Literature and national languages programs in which you would have French and German, Spanish and the new Italian program there would be a single framework in which multicultural exchange could take place. What thoughts do you have about that kind of reorganization?

**H:** I need to learn a lot more about the dynamics of how things happen; Presidents don't change faculty. To find out how that worked, what the options are for evolution, what the options are for changes. I know that whenever we put forward a new Ph.D. program at Kansas we had to have a complete analysis of the costs and the resources. Nothing gets approved unless there is one analysis or two. And in fact we had a child clinical program approved about 3 years ago and we didn't get the money. The reasons it was cancelled were twofold. We were holding it until we had the resources. But finally there was an internal commitment to it, so now it's going forward. You venture on very fragile grounds if you start developing new Ph.D. programs and you don't have the resources.

**A:** New York and CUNY are in the midst of a traumatic budget crisis. Some commentators have publicly wondered about the utility of the Graduate School. There is an assault every year on this institution, noting that we do not clearly provide a definite public service such as job training programs. How would you respond to that?

**H:** Well, I expect that recruiting me is a response. I don't understand where the criticisms are coming from and what the best way to answer that is.

**A:** There was an Op-ed piece which acting President Cahn responded to last Fall in *The New York Times*. A history professor at NYU and an ex-professor at one of the SUNY schools, attacked the Graduate Center on the grounds that we offer a cheap Ivy League education to upper class people. Others also point out that this graduate school doesn't train tomorrow's workforce, except as teachers. This leads to another anti-graduate school argument which is voiced primarily by the faculty of the other colleges who would like to see the Ph.D. programs move out to the sen-

ior colleges such as the Hunter and Queens.

**A:** Still others say, "Why have a Ph.D. program in New York City—why not move it up to Binghamton, for example?"

**H:** Well, this is a unique graduate school in its arrangement and I don't have a quick answer to those arguments. The question obviously is who's your constituency, whom are you serving? We need to think how best to serve the city.

**A:** Would you consider using the Presidential forums that President Proshansky had, as a place where the relationship between graduate and undergraduate education could be explored by a number of factions? The local colleges cut off their own toes when they attack the Graduate Center, since we provide them with a pool of very cheap teachers. Do you see yourself trying to promote that kind of dialogue?

**H:** I don't know about that forum, but one of the things I talked about in the interview process was that people care about you when you find ways for the institution to have a meaningful relationship above and beyond what already exists—that's one of my interests. How to work on that agenda has yet to be developed.

**A:** But is that practical during the Reagan-Bush era? There have been cutbacks and the loss of many teaching positions. Yet, when I see that CUNY is reluctant to hire its own graduates, it becomes an annex for the Ivy League. What can be done for students at the CUNY Graduate Center that they can attain a satisfying career?

**H:** I don't know. It is hard to know. I don't have any quick responses. The picture for federal support constantly changes and I know that one way to increase aid to graduate students is to increase federal grant aid. Is that possible here? I don't know, but we will have to try.

**A:** At a recent meeting of the student government several student representatives proposed an increase in the student activity fee. As president will you support such a proposal?

**H:** I have to see it in its context.

**A:** At the Graduate Center we have not yet democratically constituted a bias and sexual harassment committee. Will you immediately move to convene such a committee, and could you generally comment on sexual harassment?

**H:** The answer to your first question is that I don't know. I need to understand the history here, and I gather there are some legal issues vis a vis the Board of Trustees. Sexual harassment, in any context, has no place in the academy. And I feel that very strongly. How you deal with it is a function of what structures you have in place, what resources, and what recourse people have, and how free they feel to bring the matter up. The last part is not an insignificant aspect. Very often these things happen in a context in which the victim does not feel safe to exercise his or her rights.

**A:** A pamphlet was produced for the student orientation session of 1990 which did not make clear what legal rights students have. The pamphlet also suggested that the psychological counselling service handle these matters. What is your response to this situation?

**H:** I would have to look at the pamphlet to see the context of the suggestion. It [the psychological counselling office] might be the only place where one can talk confidentially.

**A:** I guess you are aware that this is a sensitive issue for gays and lesbians. We have been repeatedly advised to seek help, to be corrected.

**H:** One of the ways we have tried to handle that [sexual harassment and victim confidentiality] at Kansas is to appoint an ombudsperson. Whether that is a model that would work here, I don't know.

## Facts & Fictions: USS Spending from p. 1

Meal and lodging expenses are reimbursed up to \$100 per night; meals cannot exceed \$25 per day (\$5 for breakfast, \$20 for dinner, no reimbursement is allowed for lunch.) Local travel must be conducted by public transportation where reasonable.

But details of exactly where money went to and how, are still mysteries for most CUNY students. Questions also remain about the role and responsibility of the central CUNY administration in the fiscal affairs of the USS. Central CUNY officers co-signed for all expenditures and endorsed checks issued for USS expenditures.

The University Student Senate administration did not have a prepared statement about these allegations until nearly three days after the first article appeared. Last week, with the elections for the Chair of the USS fast approaching in mid-October, Jean LaMarre, the embattled Chair, and his assistant Aston Greene began making appearances to assemblies of CUNY student governments to explain how they had spent their budget and refute the characterization of their spending practices made by the daily newspapers. Michael Yomi, the new representative to the USS from the Graduate Center, says he was contacted by the current USS administration so they could personally refute the charges.

Jean LaMarre claimed the motivation behind these charges were the political aspirations of his opponents. LaMarre was reelected as chair of the USS at the recent election on October 13. In an interview with *The Advocate*, Aston Greene, College Community Liaison for the USS, and second in command to LaMarre, criticized in particular Rafael Alvarez, the former USS Vice-President for Fiscal Affairs who brought the expenditures to the attention of the *Student Leader*. Greene claimed Alvarez never showed to meetings of the steering committee on which he sat, and failed to make financial reports to the USS. At CUNY assemblies LaMarre has questioned why Alvarez made the allegations now, so close to the election time. Alvarez has countered that he was blocked from getting access to USS expenditures by a clique that runs the USS, and only got hold of them in September, the assistant to the Dean of Student Affairs. LaMarre claimed Alvarez himself was seeking office, though Alvarez was not a candidate in last weekend's elections. *The Advocate* was unable to get comment from Alvarez despite repeated phone calls.

In an interview conducted with LaMarre by the *Kingsman*, a Brooklyn College paper, LaMarre attributed the news coverage by *Daily News* columnist Juan Gonzalez, whose articles were highly critical of LaMarre, to a personal friendship between Alvarez and Gonzalez, and blamed the "bias against him on the comradery between Latinos." [*Kingsman*, September 30, 1991]

The *Kingsman*, a home campus paper for LaMarre, also quoted LaMarre as saying that the widely reported story of limousines was a distortion. LaMarre countered that the cars provided by XYZ car service were Lincoln Town cars not limousines and disputed that he insisted on car phones, saying that cars with cellular phones were, "Luck of the draw." The internal audit says that a total of \$12,788, 3% of the total projected available funds, was billed by XYZ to the USS. The report goes on to say that, "Although the service had been used throughout the year, the first request for payment, for the entire \$12,788 was not submitted until September. Documentation regarding the individuals using the service and the purposes is incomplete. Until explanations are provided to indicate the nature of the charges and their relationship to USS business, we question the appropriateness of these expenditures."

In the *Kingsman*, LaMarre disputed a reported \$7,700 spent on walkie-talkies for a single rally as inaccurate, saying the bill was closer to \$1000. Greene confirmed the \$7,700 bill but said the walkie-talkies had been used for several rallies. Chivon Thornhill, the councilperson for the Day Student Government of Baruch college, who organized the rally at which the walkie-talkies were used, also confirmed the \$7,700 figure as accurate, but said the bill would have been much less if they had been returned on time. Thornhill says 29 walkie-talkies were rented for the March 14 rally at the cost of approximately \$800. The walkie-talkies were returned to the USS office that night

and, "The USS was supposed to return them the next day," says Thornhill. The USS decided to keep them for the March 19 rally in Albany. Thornhill says it would have been cheaper to have returned them and then rented them again.

In this exclusive interview with his home-campus paper, LaMarre insisted that the legislative conference in Albany, reported to have cost \$50,000, in fact cost \$36,000 for 200 people, and that this included hotel fees and buses. The Albany Hilton, where the conference was held, told the *Advocate* that the entire bill for rooms and meals was \$49,731. The conference was held February 22, 23 and 24 and approximately 104 rooms were booked for each night at \$70 a night. Aston Greene confirmed that the hotel bill totaled \$49,731, adding, "When Jean said it cost \$36,000 he was referring to the hotel bill we had budgeted for; we had only approved to spend \$36,000." 52 more people came to the conference than had been expected, bringing the number up to 202, according to Greene, which incurred a further bill of \$13,000. Greene stressed that the hotel bill included breakfast, lunch and banquet dinners for all conference participants, plus expenses for music and honorariums for keynote speakers who spoke at the banquet dinners. "It was a full fledged conference," said Greene, "Before or since, there has not been any event like this." Participants in this conference, planned as a strategy session for fighting the proposed budget cuts, included CUNY Chancellor Ann Reynolds, the Chancellor from SUNY, former CUNY Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Tilden LeMelle, and Vice-Chancellor Jay Hirshenson.

Greene also confirmed that a further \$4,400 was spent on 3 buses that brought participants to and from the conference.

CUNY's internal audit report says that lodging and meal rates for the Albany conference, in excess of allowable per-diem expenditures for lodging and meals, were exempt from state guidelines for these categories, as, "Meals at the Albany conference were provided in a conference setting and not as part of a per-diem allocation for each traveller." Under new codes to which the university is holding the USS, effective September 24, the day after articles appeared in newspapers, conference expenditures will no longer be exempt from state guidelines which place a \$25 per person, per-diem cap on food expenses, and do not reimburse for lunches. *The Advocate* estimates \$40 was spent per person, per-diem on food expenses at the Albany conference.

Allegations printed in several newspapers that \$24,000 was spent on room service were erroneous, according to the report, and stemmed from its being wrongly noted on the hotel bill as room service. According to the audit, and confirmed by the Albany Hilton, this \$24,000 was in fact the restaurant bill for 3 daily meals for conference participants, including the banquet dinners. Concerning the Albany conference, the report concludes that, "Although lists of the names of attendees at the various conferences and the specific charges for meals are not complete, conference attendance and sponsorship is an appropriate use of student fees and is common throughout CUNY and other academic institutions."

The Student Association of the State University, SUNY's equivalent of the USS, co-sponsored this legislative conference, but incurred total conference fees of \$4,000, according to SASU Executive Vice-President Mary Kate Cullen. The 100 students from SASU who attended the conference were housed with Albany students, SASU does not cover hotel fees.

The USS organized another conference last spring, titled, "Non-Violence and Leadership into the 20th century" and held at the Golden Arrow Inn at Lake Placid, New York. Aston Greene said the total conference expenses were \$24,000, the *Student Leader* claimed the conference cost \$26,968. This discrepancy appears to lie in the estimated and actual costs, actual costs were lower due to less people attending than expected. 13 CUNY campuses out of 20 attended, 126 student pre-registered, but according to Greene, many of this number did not attend. Greene estimates 75 people attended, though he claimed more arrived towards the end of the conference. CUNY Vice-Chancellor Jay Hirshenson was again in attendance and spoke to the conference attendees; speakers who received honoraria were Dick Gregory and Adam Clayton Powell IV.

The \$9000 declared impermissible refers to two ex-

penditures of \$4500 each, for loans to USS officers and legal fees for 5 CUNY students. \$4,500 in loans was approved by the USS steering committee, in a vote of 5 to 2, for 3 students affiliated with the USS: a Senator; the Vice-Chair for International Student Affairs; and Liz LaMarre, the Executive Assistant to Jean LaMarre, her brother. The loans went towards paying travel fees and related expenses for these students to attend the African/African-American Summit, held in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, last April. The audit states, "No provisions exist in the applicable guidelines that would permit the loaning of student fees to any individuals. In addition, no written agreement specifying the terms and conditions of the loan is known to exist."

Greene disputing that the USS went outside of appropriate guidelines in providing these loans, said in reference to the by-laws that govern the USS, "There is nothing that says we can do it or can't." Greene also said plans were made for the repayment of the loans by the end of the Fall 1991 semester.

The African/African-American Summit, held in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, was organized by Leon H. Sullivan, a Senior Board member of General Motors, and the International Foundation for Education and Self-Help, of which Sullivan is a founder. The International Foundation funded two more students affiliated with USS to attend the conference. These students were to have been Jean LaMarre and Jacqueline Pon de Jure, from City College. When LaMarre could not attend, Aston Greene went in his place. Greene says that the reasons for providing these loans to the students, is that the USS "Recognized the importance of students being there at that watershed moment." This conference was according to Greene the first such conference to bring together Africans and African-Americans in Africa. There were 42 student delegates from the United States at this conference, representing 25 colleges. Stemming from Greene's participation in this conference, and his subsequent position as co-chair of the National Student's Support Council for Africa, a student organization that developed from this conference, Greene delivered testimony in front of the Senate and House subcommittees on Africa. Greene commented, "We have aggrandized the name of the Senate."

The \$4,500 remaining of the \$9,000 that was deemed impermissible went to pay the legal fees for the defense of students facing criminal charges as a result of damages to the Governor's offices caused during a March 19 rally protesting state budget cuts, held in Albany. Student fees, according to the audit, cannot be used to defend students against criminal charges, "except as part of a pre-existing legal service available to all students."

The legal fees went to attorney Jack Lester who is on a retainer of \$3,500 to the USS. Lester wanted payment beyond his retainer, according to Greene, because of his work in defending one of the students who was charged with a felony. Of the 8 students arrested during the melee that occurred outside of the Governor's offices, 5 were CUNY students. One of these students, William Kirksey of Medgar Evers College, said Lester made a day trip to Albany to defend them, and had them all plead guilty. Three, including Kirksey, received fines of \$250 for disorderly conduct, resisting arrest and obstructing justice. A fourth was also charged with criminal trespass, and received a higher fine.

Greene claimed the Board ruled that the USS could not pay for legal fees after the arrests and legal defense, and added, "To charge those expenditures are illegal ex post facto."

The hirings of LaMarre's sister, Elizabeth, to a \$26,000 salaried position as his Executive Assistant, and LaMarre's friend Aston Greene to a \$29,000 salaried position as College Community Liaison received considerable press coverage, but was not criticized by the internal audit report. The report, referring to Liz LaMarre states, "There are no rules specifically prohibiting the hiring of family members, and the full USS approved the hiring and the salary rate of \$500 per week (\$26,000 annually)." The third salaried position at the USS is the Executive Secretary, who receives \$19,500. The part-time editor, Steve Kleinberg, of the *CUNY Newsbeat*, the USS's newspaper, makes \$150 a week. Kleinberg is also LaMarre's spokesperson.

The Chair and 8 vice-Chairs receive stipends. LaMarre's monthly stipend is \$655, the vice-chairs receive \$360.25 each.

Tara McGann



### Congratulations, "Sister" Clare from p. 4

there a social structure which supports the decision to "keep" a pregnancy, and will support the family if a woman dies in childbirth? Families have, across cultures and throughout history, controlled the number of children raised. The question is what social and economic environment frees up the possibility of deciding to have children, and what social climates produce safe versus unsafe abortions.

\*It indicates an intellectual paucity to simply make abortion illegal. Illegality has rarely stopped a behavior. Mr. Clare's argument regarding prostitution would seem to refute his own case. What ever one believes is the correct moral stance regarding either prostitution or abortion, making the action illegal is hardly a mechanism for reducing the incidence of the behavior. Actually, in a society in which virtually everything else is for "sale", including political integrity, I'm not sure there is an argument for protecting [the] exclusivity of vaginas. It would seem more rational to propose "decent" well-paying "esteemed" jobs as a curb to the rental of vagina work.

There is one particularly good point in the letter, the issue of defining "life" or more germanely, "human". I would agree that from my moral posture, all life has value, from vegetation, and dolphins to humans. Yet we consistently make decisions to "kill". Some of those decisions are relatively easy. I have few qualms about the destruction of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) or the mosquito. Other decisions are or should be more difficult and subject to public debate: The determination of "human" is in fact more difficult. The courts currently are using brain waves, not the heart beat, as a critical criteria for life of a human, but the unarguable is intellectually much more tentative. And it has been debated, at least, since the Catholic Church discussed whether indigenous peoples of the Americas were human. (At one point they were officially not human.) Abortion was not contrary to Catholic doctrine until the discussion of computer intelligence and debates within anthropology. Birth is a convenient demarcation, not an agreed upon definition. Other societies have conferred different points of inclusion to the category "human", and conferred different rights. Reason, rationality, morality and the mechanism for decisions are themselves in a state of definitional flux. And the question of who has the power to make what decisions is a debate which has troubled many civilizations, not just ours. For those of us who propose democracy as the tendering of power as equitably as possible, it is an historic(al) moment of decision on many fronts, particularly on issues involving social justice.

I do have qualms that abortion is the "most elitist doctrine ever conceived," but it is a worthy pun. Genocide of Native Americans, bombing civilian water supplies, slavery, and numerous other acts would seem to rank at least on an equivalent level.

I would hope that alternatives to abortion could be fostered. But creating a climate in which all children are wanted and protected by a loving society is not apt to be produced immediately. We do though have other immediate options given the current medical technology. I would support Mr. Clare in a demand for federal and state funding to transplant fetuses into his mother's/wife's/girlfriend's uterus. I believe we have the resources, if properly managed, to support the population. It is a relatively cost-effective way of saving the "life", and I would assume his family would raise the child and assume responsibility for care, feeding, education and health care. I have further good news. According to a source, very soon we will have the technology for men to carry the fetus to term in their abdominal cavity. I look forward to congratulating Mr. Clare on his pregnancy.

Kim Edel  
Ph.D. department in Sociology

### Nothing Short of Totalitarian from p. 4

are even aware of the existence of the DSC and the chartered organizations. The DSC does an extremely poor job educating the student population about the facilities it provides and explaining to students how the \$8.35 student fee they pay every semester is used. Mr. Hayes does not address any of the issues expressed in the article which largely deal with the accountability of the DSC to the student body and the responsibilities of the elected DSC officials toward their constituents. Instead he chooses to implicitly denounce Mr. McClintock as a racist, a sexist and a homophobe.

Mr. Hayes jumps from "Empowering Cronies" to *ETCETERAS*, comparing articles written by students and faculty, both for and against the occupation, to reactionary right-wing publications funded by conservative foundations. Mr. Hayes's coup de grace, however, is his annihilation (in print of course) of the so-called three homophobes. He attacks three passages from articles printed in *ETCETERAS*, which, he says if not homophobic in themselves, reveal a similar panic in the face of potential empowerment of queers. I can only respond to his incomplete reading of my own article. Mr. Hayes claims that I assume that all strikers fighting for educational rights are straight. Merely an assumption Mr. Hayes! If you had read my article carefully I mention the fact that the strike was made up of people of different sexualities, genders and races... I was merely pointing out the hypocrisy of the Strike Committee which prohibited some students from entering the building while allowing access to others.

It appears that the Graduate Student Advocate does not have enough to fill its pages. In the September issue the editors of the Advocate used up a lot of space attacking *ETCETERAS*, in articles, a letter and an editorial. Is this because some of the articles were right on target? Or is because the editors desperately need an enemy?

Dissent is an integral part of democracy. The editors criticized Mr. McClintock for attacking the student government. Recent reports about the University Student Senate (USS) remind us that student leaders too can be corrupt. If students are not allowed to criticize their

### Be Careful with Words from p. 4

I'm not clear about the tradition to which Mr. Hayes refers, but let me again try to make my point. I believe the protest would have been more effective had it focused exclusively on the tuition issue. Struggles may be inseparable, but that doesn't argue for a tactic of "comprehensive protest." I think even Mr. Hayes would agree that precisely because of the diffusion of focus that accompanies issue linkage, it has been necessary for queers to advance their cause

### My Heart in my Throat from p. 4

I sincerely wish that the effort put forth by the strikers might have been one that every student could have zealously supported. Who knows, we might even have had a greater potential for success. Instead, I carry my heart in my throat every time I walk into a class, wondering who is friend or foe in the tightly drawn camps left in the wake of the occupation. These deactivists have managed to collapse the entire social structure of the Graduate School into categories that we, as scholars, should have moved far beyond by now: the I/you, us/them dichotomy. The truly unfortunate aspect of this is that many of the people who have participated in this terror are among the most gifted of the students I have known at the Graduate Center, and yet they fail to see that one act of tyranny is no better than another. The strikers must accept the responsibility for their acts, which includes the loss of salary by the Dining Commons staff and the equipment and data failure in the computer center. If there had not been a strike, these events would not have occurred.

Everyone here has had to meet rigid standards to enter this institution, and in that sense we are members of a very elite group. After all someone else must perform the labor for us to enjoy the leisure that makes it possible for us to do our work. It is difficult for me to imagine that anyone in this institution supports budget cuts and tuition increases that would prevent anyone who meets academic standards from receiving a college education. These cuts not

elected representatives without being labelled as right-wing reactionaries then the editors' attitude is nothing short of totalitarian.

Binita Mehta  
Ph.D. department in French

through their own separate, vigorous advocacy, instead of through general civil rights advocacy.

In the future, I would hope Mr. Hayes reads before he labels. I would also hope that the Advocate's editors would check their copy to ensure that those singled out within it are represented fairly and accurately.

Evan Stark  
Ph.D. Department in Social and Personality Psychology

### Hayes Responds

In accusing me of taking his comments out of context, Mr. Stark has failed to consider how they work in their larger context of the political discourse in, specifically, *ETCETERAS* as a whole and, generally, in academia. I have not labeled anyone, I have instead examined the implications of a public discourse and tried to point out its presumptions, whether conscious or not. The author's intention means little in these matters. I did not suggest that Mr. Stark opposed the lesbian and gay movement, but rather that his opposition to linkage is problematic. (The word "linkage" itself points to a sexual suggestion strengthened by its

alliteration with "lesbian".) I do not agree that queers organize separately because a precise focus is more efficient, we have been forced to do so because of homophobia within a larger movement and its failure to "link" with us/our issues. By countering a political argument with the accusation of irresponsible journalism, Mr. Stark reinscribes his response into a current discourse I sought to criticize, a current which reduces political discourse to political attacks on individual rights. (I decided that the tradition of divide and conquer is obvious enough.)

Jarrod Hayes  
Ph.D. department in French

**Editor's Note:** The Advocate congratulates all CUNY grads who joined with several thousand New Yorkers and the Women's Health Action Mobilization (WHAM) to defend a woman's right to safe, legal abortions and protest the "human cross" made by the "pro-lifers" down 5th Avenue on Sunday, Sept. 29.

only effect the students of SUNY and CUNY, but also every elementary, junior, and senior high school student as well. If we lose a young mind it is difficult to get it back, thus a far greater emphasis must be made to hold on to these young minds so that they too will be able to command the education that we enjoy.

Now YOU/THEY have decided to seize the power base seized, along with the Graduate Center to further your personal agendas. I for one have no interest in seeing my activity fees increased and placed in the hands of the very people who prevented the primary activity of the university to be carried out last spring, namely the exchange of ideas. Once you have cut the links with your fellow students, who clearly share your concerns, how can you expect to persuade anyone that CUNY is tax money well spent? It now seems that many of the things which might have enriched my life at the Graduate Center, such as The Advocate, have fallen under suspicion as instruments to defend your misplaced deeds.

This world needs a lot of work, but I am uncertain as to whether the occupiers possess the humanity they lay claim to in their position. There are always many ways to interpret, and we all do so under the influence of our convictions. My opposition is to the method employed, your version of morality is not better than mine. Bear in mind that you cannot fool around with the Real and expect everything to remain the same, for even your own role has been altered.

Deborah Smith-Bernstein, Ph.D. program in Comparative Literature

### Rules & Recommendations from p. 4

While I have no trouble understanding doctoral students' desires to be given absolute preference, I suggest that we look at this issue from the point of view of CUNY's nearly 200,000 undergraduates. Why should they be held hostage to the admission policies of doctoral programs? They have a right to expect that hiring decisions at the colleges will also take their best interests into account.

When the colleges need to hire someone with a particular speciality or, as often happens, they need to hire in a hurry, they cannot always make enrollment in a CUNY doctoral program the highest priority. Once someone has demonstrated their competence in the classroom, should they be summarily discharged simply because they are not studying at CUNY? And for that matter, should a CUNY doctoral student who has been adjuncting be let go on completion of his or her degree? Such situations occur regularly, and yet a firm policy like that described last month would seem to require a college to fire such adjuncts any time a CUNY doctoral student complained.

My point is that even as we do seek to offer preference to CUNY doctoral student (who, all other things being equal, probably do deserve it), it would be unfair and perhaps even absurd to make this an absolute requirement. Just possibly (given some of the policies in place), this is why it is not.

Glenn Petersen  
Professor in Anthropology, CUNY-GC

**Editor's note:** Prof. Petersen is correct when he states that The Advocate conflated rules about the hiring of Grad A & B lines with recommendations about hiring adjuncts, we disagree with him though about his interpretation of these recommendations. Subsequent to the Advocate announcement in the last issue, we spoke with Provost Marshall. Check the next issue.

## The End of Open Admissions?

When Chancellor Ann Reynolds took office in 1990 one of her priorities was planning for the implementation of the College Preparedness Initiative (CPI). Reynolds had authorized a similar plan during her tenure as Chancellor at California State University, a plan which required students to take a series of high school prerequisite courses to boost their academic competence before they entered the university. Here in New York, the College Preparedness Initiative will require students to take 16 units of specially designated high school courses in order to qualify for admission to CUNY's 4-year colleges. The CUNY Board of Trustees plans to vote on the passage of this proposal in next January.

The reasoning behind Reynolds' plan is simple. It is clear that larger numbers of students are entering college without the proper skills to do the work. Since many students lack adequate writing skills, competence with basic algebra and geometry, etc., Chancellor Reynolds believes that a more thorough high school education will alleviate the problem and allow college courses to operate on a higher level. And Reynolds backs up her claims with one statistic which correlates success in college with an increase in college preparatory classes taken in high school.

The CPI course requirements are based on the conclusions of a March 1991 study completed by the University Faculty Senate. But the policy itself is being developed by a group chosen through Reynolds. In an interview with Dr. Robert Picken, Chair of the University Faculty Senate and ex-officio Trustee, he expressed his concern about the present direction of the group's decisions, particularly about the restriction of open admissions to 4-year college students and overly tough requirements for community college students. Chancellor Reynolds' policy group, headed by Dr. Joyce Brown, is due to submit its final recommendations to the Chancellor in November, but the current policy information provided here was obtained from CPI literature and through an interview with Dr. Brown.

Although the Reynolds administration claims that this plan will bring "no change" in the present open admissions policy, it will triple the present requirements for admission to the 4-year colleges. These are: four years of "college-prep" English, four years of "college-prep" social science, three years of "college-prep" mathematics, two years of "college-prep" laboratory science, and one year of art, all with a 75% cumulative average. Students who have not met these requirements will not be admitted to the 4-year CUNY colleges. Instead, they will be asked to make up these courses at CUNY community colleges. Students may apply to the 4-year colleges after they have completed these courses. In some cases, students will receive college credit for these prerequisite courses, but if they are made up in the student's prospective major, they will not receive college credit for them. On the community college level, all students must also fulfill the same CPI requirements which the 4-year students must fulfill. The administration believes this policy will keep CUNY from developing "two tiered" standards among

## Bashing Criticism from p. 4

Benita Mehta's honest mistake about who sponsored the Lesbian and Gay teach-in, hardly qualify. And even Roman's homophobia was subtle, not obvious, and therefore should have been debated, not censored.]

Conclusion:

George, the publisher and editor of *Etceteras*, is racist, sexist, and homophobic. He must be part of a reactionary conspiracy, going on around the country, to "manipulate populist and leftist rhetoric to foment panic and to divide and destroy communities such as our own for exclusive and malicious ends."

George is one of the most militant anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-homophobic liberals I know. Jarrod talks about one of the allegedly homophobic writers' inability to deal with the "Other." But the "Other" of the discourse of the *Advocate* is clearly George, because he criticized the paper and offered an alternative to it. And it is permissible to use whatever twisted logic there is available to heap abuse upon this Other, and to marginalize him by stirring up panic about reactionary conspiracies!

Finally, we come to "Cronies R Us," the editorial board's response to "Empowering Cronies." We read here, before any analysis is put forward, that if it is "given that Mr. McClintock's allegations are false, and that his targets are his fellow students and the student government ... his actions are destructive and, ultimately, sad." First the editors assume, without any proof as yet, that George is wrong. Then they make the implicit assumption that if someone is wrong, their views are automatically

"destructive." By this logic, no one should ever express new or dissenting opinions, for fear that they may be false and thus destructive. I find such logic to be totalitarian.

The editors also attack George for criticizing his fellow students and the student government. This is also grounds, it would seem, for labeling George's piece "destructive." What exactly is so "destructive? Why is the Administration, the Governor, the financial class, etc., open to criticism [and rightfully so] and not our own selves, our self-governmental structure, etc.? What good does it do to pretend oneself, one's community, or one's leaders, to be perfect, when there might be flaws that need to be addressed? But let's assume for the sake of the argument that, by some miracle, we are perfect (perhaps because we are "politically correct"). If there are no flaws, what's the harm in tolerating and honestly debating those who say there are?

On to the actual argument, which occurs after the conclusion is drawn and judgement pronounced. I agree that "the current DSC ombudsprogram does not have the resources to fully advocate student rights," and that SER's effective control of the DSC student government is not necessarily undemocratic. I'm a believer in parties, and that when a party wins the support of the majority, it should control the government.

But, in the first place, I am troubled, as an SER member, when George reports that someone in SER "glee"-fully bragged to him that SER "controls the student government!" Such sentiments are not democratic. There is a hint here of tyranny of the majority. This statement was a threat that since George lacks power, he

shall have to take his place "on the dustbin of History." For George to call attention to such sentiments and criticize them is all to the good. It is neither destructive nor sad.

Secondly, as I wrote in an article for George a few years ago, I do not believe that the current selection process for DSC officials is genuinely democratic. People vote in DSC rep elections for candidates who are never consulted as to whether they actually wish to run! This has been the standard mispractice ever since Vincent Tirelli left the Chairpersonship position. There is also no opportunity to campaign, to find out what the candidates stand for. And the top officials on the Steering and Executive Committees are not even elected by the graduate students as a whole. They are elected by the Council, like any good corrupt trade union.

I support a fee increase. And I strongly support the goals of SER. Most if not all of us are good, well-meaning, dedicated, courageous people. And it is not SER's fault that we benefitted from DSC elections that are sloppy, too quiet, indirect, and thus undemocratic. This is a fact that George seems to have forgotten. But the fact that SER now allegedly controls the DSC Steering Committee is no indication that the majority of students here wanted it that way. I hope that SER refuses to smugly rest upon our newfound laurels, as one among our number seem to think we should. I hope we will act to shore up our fragile position by further democratizing the DSC. And I thank George, once again, for calling it to our attention.

Tom Smith

Ph.D. department in Political Science

## Editor's Response: Now Comes The Turn Around Time

In the September 30th issue of the *The Nation* Jon Wiener analyzes Dinesh D'Souza's recapitulation of the Stephen Thernstrom controversy. Apparently, Thernstrom, a History professor at Harvard, taught a course titled "The Peopling of America." When several African-American students protested the content and what they believed to be the political subtext of the class, Professor Thernstrom refused to teach the class again, and declared himself a victim of McCarthyism. As Wiener aptly points out, "Under McCarthyism, professors didn't voluntarily decide not to teach after being criticized by students; they were prevented from teaching - fired - after being criticized by the government."

The allegations that *The Advocate* is guilty of "bashing" (Tom Smith) as well as "personal attacks" and "ugly assaults" (Deborah Smith-Bernstein) utilize the same rhetorical reversal as that of Thernstrom and his champion, Dinesh D'Souza (author of the bestseller, *Illiberal Education*). Both Smith and Smith-Bernstein, like Thernstrom, equate political debate, such as the editors' criticism of George McClintock's politics, with the most extreme examples of bodily violence. We

find this equation preposterous. Neither do we argue, as Tom Smith suggests, that he or Ms. Smith-Bernstein (or even Prof. Thernstrom) are part of a right-wing conspiracy; we point out, rather, that their words, phrases and arguments are part of a larger discourse, which is not wholly their own and with which they must acknowledge and engage, if they are to act in good faith. Though Benita Mehta does not accuse us of violence (though she does accuse Jarrod Hayes of "annihilation") she does state that we do not allow "criticism", and suggests that we somehow silence our critics by "labelling" them "right-wing reactionaries". Never mind that we have published Mr. McClintock's "criticism", as well as many letters which are critical of the editors of *The Advocate*, it does not follow that such "criticism" is somehow squelched by the "labels" which Ms. Mehta believes we have affixed to Mr. McClintock. (By the way, what's with the "totalitarian" label). Indeed, in the current social space, when leftists and other progressives engage in political discourse, they are accused of violence and, in Ms. Mehta's case, censorship. Democracy entails debate and argument which is not necessarily polite, and is

often unfriendly. Still, Ms. Smith-Bernstein presupposes and then imposes her perception of an undivided and amiable social space at the Graduate School. She goes on to lament that classes are now divided into camps of "us" and "them" and thereby attempts to chill all debate with which she does not agree. Readers should note that she, like Mr. Smith when he worries about a smug SER member, transforms political discourse into a matter of personal behavior. Like the CUNY Board's identification of student strikers as criminals, or the anti-NEA antics of Jesse Helms, this is a politics of moralism.

Finally, Mr. Smith writes that we "assume without any proof" that Mr. McClintock's charges are false. Where are these mythic anti-strike articles, George? To the contrary, it is Mr. McClintock who charges without proof, that we are cronies, that our editorial was motivated by cynicism, and conjures up an absurd image of a corrupt DSC political machine. Please!

*The Advocate* welcomes all letters, including those which are critical of this newspaper and its editorial staff, and will consider all submissions for possible publication.

Andrew Long, Tara McGann

the colleges and will minimize community college "tracking" of students in high school. Thus admissions at the community colleges still stay "open" but the terms of graduation are much more strict - all CUNY students will have three years of college prep mathematics. Regrettably, some community college students might spend all of their two years just filling the college preparatory requirements.

One of the largest changes the plan will bring is, of course, on the high school level. Many schools will be reorganizing teaching loads and syllabi to prepare students to meet the new requirements. Clearly, this is a welcome change for a sys-

tem which has been forced to drop standards for a variety of reasons over the years. Yet as noted in the Faculty Senate's report to the Chancellor, students who presently take the Board of Education's recommended course load would still fail to meet the new CPI standards for admission to a 4-year college by "substantially fewer academic units." The problem is not that high school preparation shouldn't be improved; it's that the new standards for admission might be too high.

Reynolds' justification for the rigorous new plan is that it worked in California, but most evidence points to the contrary. CPI propaganda states that minority admis-

sion actually increased 5-7% during implementation of the plan in California, but fails to recognize that minority admission has increased at virtually every college in the country, regardless of CPI. For example, the University of Vermont, whose students took over the administration building last spring to protest the schools' failure to recruit minority student and faculty, can yet claim double the minority "percentage" increase of any CSU school. Reynolds' CPI propaganda also does not state that since the first year of CPI implementation in California, 1988, the size of the freshman class has decreased at the

continues on p. 11



## Arts &amp; Events

Must  
See  
Movies

THEATER 80, 80 St. Mark's Pl between 1st & 2nd Ave. Admission \$7

Wed, Oct. 23 "Wild Strawberries" (2:00, 5:25, 8:50) & "Shame" (3:35, 7:00, 10:25) by Ingmar Bergman. "Wild Strawberries" especially. The great Swedish director Victor Sjöström's swan song and the ravishing beauty of Bibi Andersson and Ingrid Thulin. For those who have ever felt regretful. A masterpiece.

Thurs, Oct. 24 "Letter From an Unknown Woman" (2:30, 5:40, 8:50) & "Caught" (4:05, 7:15, 10:25) by Max Ophüls. Two American films by the director of "La Ronde" & "Le Plaisir."

Sun, Nov. 10 "Seven Samurai" (1:15, 5:00, 8:45) by Akira Kurosawa. The full-length version.

Mon, Nov. 11 "The Threepenny Opera" (1:30, 5:05, 8:40) by G.W. Pabst & "The Blue Angel" (3:25, 7:00, 10:35) by Josef von Sternberg.

Wed, Nov. 13. "Jezebel" (3:15, 6:45, 10:15) & "The Letter" (5:05, 8:35) by William Wyler. A Bette Davis double feature!

Tues, Nov. 19. "The Big Heat" (3:00, 6:00, 9:00) & "Beyond a Reasonable Doubt" (4:35, 7:35, 10:35) by Fritz Lang.

THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART, 11 W. 53rd St. between 5th & 6th Aves. Admission included in museum admission.

A retrospective: "Vittorio DeSica behind the Camera and on the Screen"

Thu, Oct. 17. "Shoeshine" (2:30)

Fri, Oct. 18. "The Bicycle Thief" (6:00)

Sat, Oct. 19 "Shoeshine" (2:00) "Miracle in Milan" (5:00)

Sun, Oct. 20 "Umberto D" (2:00) "The Bicycle Thief" (5:00)

Tues, Oct. 22 "Umberto D" (6:00)

Thurs, Oct. 24 "Miracle in Milan" (6:00)

Tues, Oct. 29 (6:00) & Thu, Oct. 31 (2:30). "The Earrings of Madame De..." by Max Ophüls. Starring the dashing Charles Boyer and DeSica.

Sat, Nov. 9 (5:00) & Mon, Nov. 11 (6:00) "The Garden of the Finzi-Continis" The fate of a Jewish family in fascist Italy before and during World War II.

Coming up: THE BROOKLYN MUSEUM, Dec 7-Feb 9. A Luchino Visconti Retrospective.

compiled by Gavin Macaulay

## BLACK FILM SERIES

**10/17 Stormy Weather** (1943) musical - Lena Horne is still closely associated with the title song she performed in the black-cast musical. This movie, which also stars Bill Robinson, is purported to be based on Robinson's life and career.

**10/24 Black Orpheus** (1959) musical/drama - French/Brazilian film that transported a classic Greek myth to the world of poor blacks in Rio de Janeiro during Carnival. Starring Marpessa Dawn and Breno Mello (Portuguese with English subtitles)

All screenings are at 6:15 p.m. in the Harold M. Proshansky Auditorium

## The Burgess 10

Where It's @!

#1 **Ban the Dam Jam**@Beacon

(74th&B'way) 7:30 765-9510. For the defense of the people of James Bay: 10/11 **Roseanne Cash**; 10/12 ex-Head **David Byrne** & the reformed, but still unreconstructed, ex-X 10/12. **Green Bay** defender **Ara Parsegian** might say, "The best defense is an offensive defense."

#2 **WFMU Legal Defense** 10/

20@Ritz, \$15, 8pm **Sonic Youth** & **John Zorn**. A Greenwich station is suing Uppsala College radio for daring to interfere with their broadcasts into NYC.

#3 **Park Lincoln Oktoberfest**@Beacon 496-7070 \$25

10/17 8pm **Squeeze** "Black Coffee in Bed" w. **Kirsty McCall** "Electric Landlady."

10/18 7&12 **BB King** & **Johnny Taylor** "Somebody's Been Sleeping (in My Bed)" w. **Mayall et al.**; **Roomful of Blues**.

10/19 8pm Why didn't I rank **Ray Charles** last ish? 'Cause **Bobby "Blue" Bland** is worth the wait. The Rev. Al "Take Me to the River" **Green** was @Summerstage last summer & back to his irreverent ways. Opening: **Staple Singers**, the first back-from-the-bible family.

Open Admissions  
from p. 10

large urban schools like CSU Northridge and Long Beach. Furthermore, more than 50% of the freshman students presently enrolled at CSU Long Beach still haven't taken their third year of CPI mathematics, and admissions officers claim that most of those who did take it, passed with Ds and Cs. Guidance counselors at the largest LA high schools (Wilson, Belmont, Huntington Park) claim that there has been "no increase" in college admission over the past five years.

So if CPI has restricted access to California schools, what benefits does it promise for CUNY? The basic advantage is a considerable financial pay-off in two ways. The first is that by frightening students into taking all of their college preparatory courses in high school, CUNY will have more money to sponsor higher level courses in the 4-year colleges. New York City picks up a lot of the tab for the 2-year colleges. The second financial advantage, related to the first, is the financial advantage CUNY stands to reap by more exclusive admission/graduation requirements by raising its stature in terms of "academic excellence", it might increase the likelihood of getting government contracts and grants.

10/20 8pm Chicago's **Buddy Guy** & the Grammy winner **John Lee Hooker** w/o partners **P. Townsend** & **B. Raitt**.

#4 **The Best of Jimi Hendrix**

10/12 @Anthology Film Archives, 32 2nd Av&2nd, Noon-5 free. **Experience. Jimi Plays Berkeley, Rainbow Bridge, Monterey Pop Festival, Isle of Wight.**

#5 **Kentucky Headhunters**@Ritz. Be ethnographically incorrect!

#6 **NY Bluesfest.**

@ Henry St. Settlement, 466 Grand, 598-0400. 10/19 \$10 1&3pm. **Howlin' Wolf** Tribute w protege guitarist **Hubert Sumlin** & rare film footage of the true blues giant. 10/20 free. 12:30&3pm **John Hammond**

@Manny's Carwash, 1558 3rd&87th 9pm 369-2583 10/17 **Lonnie Brooks** The new voice of blues.

@Lone Star, 242 W 52 9pm 245-2950

10/16 Don't be thinking **Rufus w. Carla Thomas** might be like **Rufus w. Chaka Khan**. The Thomases are the finer rarity. Ex-Memphis DJ **Rufus Thomas** is remembered for "Walkin' the Dog" while daughter **Carla's** "Tramp" was a duet w **Otis Redding**.

#7 **Every Day I Have the Blues**

10/11-17 Various.

bluesicians@42&Madison Atrium noons Fri: **John Campbell** Mon: **Lonnie Pitchford** Tue: **Tabby Thomas** Wed:

**R.L. Burnside** Thu: **Henry Townsend** Fri: **Satan&Adam**. Conveniently situated 2 blocks fr CUNY. Free admission, despite your tuition.

#8 **Best Vets**@Bottom Line, 15 W4th, 228-6300.

10/12-13 **The Roches**. 10/21 **Ben Sidran** & **Georgie Fame**. 10/23 **Leo Kottke**. 10/28 **Maceo Parker**. 10/29 **June Tabor** #9 **Red Hot Chili Peppers** w. **Smashing Pumpkin** 11/11&12&15 @Roseland, 239 W52. Vegetarian Paradise.

#10 **Up&coming Paramount Chiefs**@MSG's bowling alley & former Felt Forum, 33&8th Av, 465-6741. Redone & renamed the Paramount invoking the aura of the '60s r&r emporium. 5600 seats w/in 174' of stage & no smoking! : the Zappesque **Jean-Luc Ponty** doing **W. African** (10/11 \$19.50); the agrarian **Jethro Tull** (11/10&11); the brontosaurian **Moody Blues** (tba); & Saturday Paramount vet herself, **Patti LaBelle** (11/1&12/2). Roll over Radio City & tell **Dionne Warwick** the news.

compiled by Thomas Burgess

hood of getting government contracts and grants.

Chancellor Reynolds has often expressed her interest in courting outside funding sources, specifically the funds of US military agencies like the Department of the Navy. In an interview with the Chancellor conducted by the Advocate during November 1990, Reynolds advocated solicitation of funding from the Department of Defense budget, specifically claiming that at the Office of Naval Research, "they always have money, lots of it." By boosting admissions requirements weighted towards proficiency in the sciences, and emphasizing graduate work in

the technological sciences, Chancellor Reynolds feels CUNY can, "compete very successfully for Federal resources."

Although few dispute the need for some kind of high school program which will help students better prepare for college, the Reynolds administration has yet to provide substantial evidence that CPI will bring beneficial results to CUNY. Nonetheless it is assured that the Board of Trustees will vote to institute the plan, regardless of what it looks like, in January.

Student for Educational Rights; Graduate Center

## Great Latino Cultural Party

## Gran Fiesta de Lanzamiento

## de las Actividades Culturales

## A. E. L. L. A.

Asociación de Estudiantes Latinos y Latino Americanos

Sede: Basement Mezzanine SC11

Tel: (212) 642-2143

Jueves 7 de Noviembre

3er. Piso del Graduate Center

Música, Comida, Tragos... !!!

La actuación de

INTI RAYMI

poetas, pintores, músicos de toda Latino América

## Notes from Your Student Government

This semester's first meeting of the Doctoral Students' Council was held on September 25, 1991. Here is a brief summary of some of the items discussed.

The DSC is attempting to deal with student complaints about the Graduate Center's Psychological Counseling Services, including the exclusion of certain students from the services without offering alternatives and a lack of openness to students' sexual orientation.

There was discussion of the letter sent to many students regarding "poor" academic standing. A letter from the DSC is being sent to Dean Moreland in protest. At the meeting, it was suggested that all students who received this letter go to the registrar and ask to learn the specific reason that they received the letter.

Numerous elections were held. Tamer Avçilar was elected to the Media Board. Michael Yomi is the Graduate Center's new representative to the University Student Senate and Michael Lewis is the alternate. Megan McCormick is the student representative for the Research Foundation Committee, and Eric Graig and Christine Kovic were chosen as student representa-

tives for Horowitz's Inauguration Committee.

There is an upcoming meeting with Chancellor Ann Reynolds to discuss graduate school concerns including adjunct positions, child care, health care, minority representation in the student and faculty body, and student involvement in budget and other administrative processes.

The DSC Budget for 1991-92 was approved and a summary is printed below.

The DSC is also working to obtain more pay phones at the Graduate Center, a jukebox for the 18th Floor, condom machines for the bathrooms, and more bulletin boards.

If you have any questions or suggestions for the DSC, please stop by in room SC 001 during the office hours listed below or call us at 642-2851. Remember that DSC meetings are open to all CUNY Graduate students as observers. If you are not an elected representative and would like to speak about a specific issue before the assembly, you should contact Michael Glassman a couple of days before the meeting by calling the DSC office.

DSC Office Hours  
Fall 91  
Room SC 001

## Monday:

1:00- 3:00 Michael Glassman, Co-Chair  
3:15- 5:15 Gordon Crandall, Co-Chair

## Tuesday:

10:00-12:00 Tamer Avçilar, Steering Committee  
2:00- 4:00 Jarrod Hayes, Steering Committee  
5:00- 7:00 Brian James, Steering Committee

## Wednesday:

11:00- 1:00 Joanna Sharf, Co-Chair  
12:00- 2:00 Gordon Crandall, Co-Chair  
1:00- 3:00 Michael Glassman, Co-Chair  
4:00- 6:00 Jonathan Krantz,  
Steering Committee

## Thursday:

10:00-12:00 Elizabeth Kelly,  
Steering Committee  
12:00- 2:00 Christine Kovic,  
Steering Committee

## Friday:

11:00- 1:00 Joanna Sharf, Co-Chair

## DSC General Meetings Fall, 1991

Monday, October 21  
Tuesday, November 19  
Thursday, December 19

All meetings will be held at 5:30 in Student Center Room 10.

## Classifieds

**Need a Job?** The DSC is looking for a work study person, 10 hrs/wk, \$10/hr. General office work. Call 642-2851. You must be eligible for work study.

**Free travel cash and excellent business experience.** Openings available for individuals or student organizations to promote the country's most successful **SPRING BREAK Tours**. Call Inter Campus-Programs. 1-800-327-6013 (Gail Sullivan)

**Need to learn FRENCH?** Native speaker from Graduate Center can help with reading, speaking, preparing for exams. Flexible hours and locations. I also have extensive experience in translation French/English. Call Chantal Combes at 718-797-1306.

**Academic Consultant.** Are you at the dissertation stage and stuck? Are you filing for reappointment, promotion or tenure at your teaching job? Need some serious handholding?

CUNY Ph.D./Queens College M.L.S. WILL HELP YOU:

- organize your time/review your tactics for completing your degree
- plan effective library research strategy
- complete your application for reappointment, promotion or tenure

Reasonable hourly rates. Confidential.

Academic Success Unlimited: (212)734-6476

Want to sell your books? Records? Looking for an apartment? Roommate? Job? Publish your classified ads and personals in *The Advocate*. Call (212) 642-2852 or place in a labeled envelop and slip it under the door at SC 18.

Where Your  
\$8.35 Goes:

DSC Budget Summary  
Fiscal Year 7/1/91 - 6/30/92  
Submitted 9/25/91  
Gordon Crandall,  
Co-chair for Business Affairs

#	Category	Budgeted Expense
101	Departmental Allocation	\$11,000
102	Chartered Organizations	6,000
103	Cultural Affairs	2,000
104	Stipends	13,686
105	Publicity	0
106	Advocate	9,500
107	Supplies	500
108	Postage	1,000
109	Telephone	600
110	Copying/Printing	1,000
111	NY Public Library Copy	2,500
112	Travel & Research	5,000
113	DSC Discretionary Fund	200
114	Steering Com. Dscr. Fund	200
115	Capital Expenditures	1,000
116	Elections	1,000
117	Coffee Hour/Social	2,700
118	DSC Travel Fund/Lobby	1,500
119	Emergency Fund	214
120	DSC Special Events	500
TOTAL		\$60,000

Reynolds Redux  
from page 1

salaries of her 6 vice-chancellors by 25% to about \$150,000 each. At the center of the controversy was the fact that Reynolds had twice assured the Board of Trustees in California, in writing, in 1984 and in 1985 that if she were given control of salary increases she would never use that authority to raise her own salary.

But when she was given control over salary increases she did just that and when the California State University Trustees were informed about the letters by an investigation of the California State legislature, they began to take actions to dismiss Reynolds. Finally, at a Board meeting in June of 1990, Chancellor Reynolds offered to resign as of October 1990. The Board demanded that she leave immediately.

At a State Assembly subcommittee meeting reported by the *Mercury Times* on April 20, 1990, Chancellor Reynolds told the Board's Vice-Chair, William Campbell that she has simply forgotten about the letters she had written in 1984 and in 1985. From the transcript of the subcommittee meeting:

*Campbell*: "I was in Sacramento when those letters were explained to me. I asked you the questions and I was not told the answers."

*Reynolds*: Could, could, I go through the, my memory again, which is basically in accordance with yours?

*Campbell*: "I think I've made my point..."

*Reynolds*: "...I have indicated my most sober apology for failing to remember those letters, for failing to remember that issue."

Equally upsetting to CSU Trustees were the 25% salary increases for Reynolds' vice-chancellors, when, according to the June 6, 1990 *San Jose Mercury Times* "at the same time, other employees of the CSU system were getting 4.18% and Reynolds was lamenting that her budget from the governor for the next year was inadequate."

Several months later, after being hired by CUNY, Chancellor Reynolds defended the creation of new positions with the explanation that the financial shortfalls of the budget have created exceptional administrative demands. As the budget shrinks, Reynold's response has been to hire more senior level administrators to newly created positions at \$60-70,000 per year to manage money CUNY does not have. The recent hiring of Jose Elique as University Director of Security, of Dean Berkman, and of Brenda Spatt, shows that at present, the Board of Trustees supports these decision, and trusts Reynolds' personal choices enough to hire Berkman and Spatt without conducting procedural searches. Concerning Reynolds' statement one year ago that Ronald Berkman's position would not be extended, her memory seems to have failed once again.

*G. Gantor is a doctoral student in the English department and active with Students for Educational Rights*

Student Government  
Presidents,  
Representatives  
and  
Concerned Students

Come to a Meeting  
and Pot-Luck Reception

Friday, October 18, 1991  
33 West 42nd Street  
Room 1400

This is an opportunity to meet other student government reps and to begin to establish a way of joining together as a collective force to work more effectively on common issues such as health care, the budget, greater student participation in campus affairs, among many others.

Preliminary agenda:

1. Networking process
2. Federation or student union?
3. What issue do we wish to work on collectively this semester?

RSVP by  
Wed., Oct. 16 at 642-2851

Bring Food!

The co-chairs of the DSC at the Graduate Center are Joanna Scharf, Michael Glassman, and Gordon Crandall