

News and Blues

Volume 2, Number 9
May 21, 1992

Published by the Graduate Student Organization at Stony Brook

Provost Releases Final Version of Academic Plan

By **Fons Haffmans**
GSO Vice President

Provost Tilden Edelstein has published his final draft of the West Campus Academic Budget Plan.

The plan was released after committees of the University Senate submitted comments in response to Edelstein's original proposal. The Academic Plan outlines proposals to meet a \$9 million budget reduction for the West Campus (which consists of all departments and institutes not associated with the Health Sciences Center). The budget for the 1992-93 academic year is almost \$4 million less than this year's budget.

In addition, SUNY has released its final budget plan as well.

SUNY's Budget Plan

The state budget reduces SUNY's budget by \$60 million. This resulted in a \$7 million decrease in Stony Brook's funding, leaving the university with a \$167 million budget for the 1992-93 fiscal year. In addition, tuition was raised

in order to increase revenues. Tuition for full-time graduate students (both domestic and international) was increased by \$800. This brings the annual tuition rate for full-time resident graduate students to \$4,000 and to \$7,316 for international students. Tuition reimbursement for Graduate Assistants and Teaching Assistants will be maintained. Part of the reimbursement will be financed out of state funds SUNY receives (\$23 million) and part of it will be financed through the increase in tuition revenues (\$27 million).

The Provost's Budget

Provost Edelstein is responsible for the administration of the West Campus. The West Campus consists of all departments and institutes not affiliated with the Health Sciences Center. In addition, the Graduate School and the Office of Undergraduate Studies are part of the provostial area. Hence any cut in the budget of the Provost will affect all departments and institutes. Currently, Edelstein predicts that he has to cut the current budget of \$76 million by \$9

million over the next three years. In the 1992-93 fiscal year the reduction will total almost \$4 million.

The reduction of the SUNY budget for Stony Brook leaves a hole in the Provost's budget of \$3.4 million. An additional deficit of \$1.4 million in the Provost's budget was due to the budget reduction halfway into this academic year. However, the mild winter and fluctuating oil prices have provided relief for at least this amount. To make ends meet in this 1991-'92 fiscal year, the Provost received \$2 million in one-time funding. Clearly these funds will not be available for next year, so this brings the budget deficit to \$5.4 million, \$1.3 million of which will be rolled over into the 1993-94 academic budget. Hence the West Campus faces a reduction of \$4.1 million this year.

Bookkeeping Tricks

The above boils down to the following: the state cut the budget and in addition some money available this academic year will not be available next academic year. Making up part of the deficit will be postponed for a year.

However, the Provost states in his Budget Plan that he intends to maintain commitments to certain academic areas. In order to do that he adds \$1.4 million to the deficit, which will be distributed as follows: \$552,100 to the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, \$90,000 to Biological Sciences, \$245,000 to the Marine Sciences Research Center, \$51,000 to Social and Behavioral Sciences, \$300,000 to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and \$200,000 to a reserve fund. The only divisions the Provost has not made a commitment to are the Physical Sciences and Mathematics, the Humanities and Fine Arts, and the Harriman School.

As was mentioned before, the Provost received 2 million in one-time funding last year. A significant part of that money (\$1.4 million) went to the divisions, notably the Humanities and Fine Arts. The HFA was bailed out last year on the condition that it would find ways to reduce its budget. All of the money went to finance GA and TA-lines in the Division. Clearly all divisions have to cut their budget because the one-time funding is no longer available, but some of them will be getting money as part of the \$1.4 million in new funding commitments. The net effect is

(Continued on Page 8)

Pepper Prevails in GSO Election

Norah Martin President; Child-care Referendum Passes

By **Gary Halada**

GSO Secretary, Election Chair, Mean Bass Player

After a hard-fought campaign for write-in votes in the Graduate Student Organization election, Jean Rousseau, a graduate student from Chemistry and currently speaker of the GSO Senate, lost in his bid to become next year's GSO Secretary.

Graduate Student Advocate Tom Pepper, whose name was on the ballot, won the only contested election by a vote of 119 to 99. Candidates Norah Martin for President, Emily A. Zakin for vice president, and Timothy Morton for treasurer won their unopposed elections, and a referendum granting a \$1-a-year activity fee increase to help subsidize campus child care was passed.

Ballots were counted Tuesday afternoon (following the Monday, 5 PM deadline for return of ballots to the GSO office). Despite concerns raised by some GSO senators about late ballot distribution, nearly two hundred and fifty ballots were returned, comparable to and even exceeding totals from some previous elections. Martin, Zakin, and Morton each won by about 200 votes over a variety of write-in candidates (including H. Ross Perot and Leona Helmsley). Martin, a doctoral candidate from the Philosophy department, said she is looking forward to a productive year working with her fellow executive officers. Timothy Morton, long-time GSO representative from the department of Ecology and Evolution and a member of the GSO budget committee, won the most votes of any candidate on the ballot in the vote for Treasurer. The term of office for all officers begins July 1, and runs to June 30, 1993.

Rousseau's write-in campaign added the only real excitement to this year's election. Election committee records show this to be the largest write-in vote for a candidate for GSO office in recent memory. This can be attributed to the hundreds of posters distributed by both Rousseau and Pepper and the campaigning that Rousseau did throughout the campus. "Graduate students have expressed a strong desire for a more active GSO by voting for me," Rousseau said. "So long as the issues I campaigned on are addressed, I have not lost."



Norah Martin

Pepper said that "Many graduate students have expressed concern about the lack of opposition on the ballot, but I think we have a politically diverse executive council and the interests of all graduate students will be pursued."

The only referendum on the ballot was the \$1-per-year activity fee increase (and a proportionally smaller increase of twenty-five cents for part-time graduate students) with the proceeds helping fund the Stony Brook Child Care Corporation. The referendum passed by a vote of 171 to 50. Executive Director Lucille Oddo said she hopes this vote will set a precedent for student involvement in child-care funding at other campuses. "It's wonderful. Graduate students have been among our initial supporters... in the tuition subsidy for low-income families [one of the achievements of the 1987 graduate student strike], and now this." About 50% of those using the child care centers are students, and most of those are graduate students.

Inside This Issue:

Editorials	2
GSO Response to Plan	3
Philosophical Differences?	4
International Spotlight	5
News from the Net	6
Ross Perot's Snake Oil	6
GSA Corner	7
Short Takes, Last Licks	8

SUNY's Student Assembly Couldn't Assemble

Last month, envoys of the Stony Brook Graduate and Undergraduate student governments attended a conference of the SUNY Student Assembly, the first meeting since it was restructured by the SUNY Trustees ("Trustees Should Accept Revisions Proposed by Student Assembly," *News and Blues*, 10/10/91, p. 2). While quorum was not reached and consequently no business transacted, the meeting was nonetheless instructional-- primarily as it showed just how wrong things can go when university administrators try to micromanage a student government. SUNY Central wasted large resources, both financial and human, to produce the first Student Assembly Annual Meeting without quorum.

The Student Assembly of SUNY is a body with delegations from each of the SUNY campuses. University Centers such as Stony Brook are represented by both graduate and undergraduate delegates. The mission of the Assembly is to advise SUNY's Board of Trustees. This they can do in two ways. Indirectly, they can pass resolutions which are forwarded to the trustees. The Student Assembly also elects the one student member of the SUNY Trustees, thus gaining a direct say in all trustee decisions. While the student trustee is only one voice among many, he or she can have an effect. It was Student Trustee Judy Krebs who successfully moved a resolution exempting SUNY TAs from last year's State payroll pay lag.

Stony Brook's student governments have a long history of active involvement in Student Assembly. This is most clearly seen by looking at the membership of another student government group, the Student Association of the State University (SASU). SASU operates independent of SUNY and is thus free to act and speak independently. Since Student Assembly's inception, SASU members have been able to control the elections of Student Assembly simply by voting as a bloc, the practical consequence being that SASU has always chosen the Student Trustee. Stony Brook has been a member of SASU/Student Assembly for many years. This is why it is so sad to see Student Assembly crippled by meddlesome administrators.

It is hard to describe just how badly run the meeting was-- you had to see it to disbelieve it. In the first place, it was scheduled to begin on a weekday, a couple of weeks before finals. It is no wonder that even with SUNY captains running around New York State hav-

ing meetings to organize the new "Student" Assembly, fewer than half of the campuses were represented. When the meeting began, it appeared that the concept of Parliamentary Procedure was going to degenerate into meaningless mush. For instance, one of the Stony Brook delegates asked the SUNY Administrator cum Student Organizer, "Who is empowered to interpret the Student Assembly constitution at this meeting?" This was met with some waffling answer to the effect that SUNY legal council had ruled such and such on this or that question. He was unwilling to allow the Student Assembly to interpret its own bylaws.

But there were high points to the meeting. The Stony Brook undergraduate representative and the representative from Albany undergraduate (both active SASU members) gave eloquent speeches. Attendees were also treated to a reasonably frank discussion of the budget situation with William Anslow, the head of SUNY's budget division. The bottom line was: lobby the governor and the legislators for more money.

There was also the opportunity for the SASU members to discuss that organization. Angus Johnson, an undergraduate from Binghamton, looks to be a promising candidate for SASU president. He has fresh ideas about how to restructure the dues arrangement to allow more campuses to join and have SASU spend less of its time worrying about whether or not a particular campus will pass a funding resolution.

Student Assembly is in danger of becoming useless. While the GSO strongly opposes the changes made to the structure of Student Assembly, we feel that now is the time for campuses to get involved. The GSO executive council will be traveling to the second attempt at an annual meeting-- this one organized by students-- in June. We have the chance to regain some degree of control over our Student Assembly, or to turn it over to the newcomers who want SUNY Central to hold them by the hand. It is time for SUNY's graduate students to help build a strong Student Assembly and to guarantee it by supporting a strong SASU.

See You Next Year!



"Our first lesson will be IMAGINARY NUMBERS. How do you divide one stipend among 50 students?"

The GSO News and Blues

Volume 2, Number 9

A publication of the
Graduate Student Organization

Room 206, Central Hall

SUNY Stony Brook

Stony Brook, NY 11794

(516) 632-6492

Ida Fuchs, Office Manager

Editor: George Bidermann

The GSO Executive Council:

Monica McTigue, President

Fons Haffmans, Vice President

Chris Kushmerick, Treasurer

Gary Halada, Secretary

Jean Rousseau, Speaker of the Senate

The GSO News and Blues is published by the Graduate Student Organization, which is solely responsible for its content. Editorials are written by a member of the executive council or its designee, and represent the majority opinion of the executive council. Letters for publication, comments, and items for submission may be mailed or delivered to the GSO office. For advertising information or more information about the GSO, call 632-6492. This issue went to press on May 20.

Goodnight Irene....

The current GSO executive council will be returning to their respective laboratory benches on June 30. We feel it necessary to reflect on the past year and offer some advice to a budget-weary campus and fellow graduate student survivors. We do not want to leave the impression that we have all abandoned a sinking ship.

Although it is clear that Stony Brook graduate students have been hard hit by recent budgetary decisions, we have gained increasing support from both the University Faculty Senate and the Stony Brook University Senate. Both senates have passed resolutions that recommend filling available adjunct positions with graduate students. On April 27, the Stony Brook University Senate endorsed a GSO-sponsored resolution calling for the restoration of state funding for graduate students and an end to the reduction in the number of TA/GA lines. Provost Tilden Edelstein has gone on record at a recent meeting of the University Senate executive committee as opposing additional cuts to continuing TA/GA lines. The Provost has stated that if graduate student lines are cut in budgets submitted by the deans, he will oppose these reductions unless they have been made on academic grounds. Finally, we have received word that full tuition waivers will be covered by SUNY Central.

The incoming executive committee will certainly face another crisis year during 1992-93. They may

face a mid-year state budget cut in addition to the cuts already set in place by the provost's Academic Budget Plan. We are sure to see an increase in student user fees, additional parking shortages, and some form of academic restructuring. Decisions made in the following years will impact every graduate program at Stony Brook. Involvement in the GSO will be more critical than ever. All graduate students, including CED/GSP, School of Social Welfare and Nursing, and graduate student employees (both TA/GAs and RAs), are entitled to representation by the GSO.

Next fall, graduate student employees (TA/GAs) may get to vote on unionization under the recently revived GSEU, however, the GSO will remain the only representative voice for a majority of Stony Brook graduate students. A word of advice-- now is not the time to hide in your laboratories and classrooms. Become active, raise your voices loud and directed, and do not assume someone else will take care of the crisis. As stated above, the GSO has gained both support and legitimacy, but it has been a hard-fought battle. Do not let these efforts go to waste.

The GSO Executive Council would like to thank Ida Fuchs (faithful friend and GSO historian), office assistants Cheryl and John, News and Blues Editor George Bidermann, members of the GSO Senate, and the University Senate. Have a great summer.

GSO Response to West Campus Academic Plan

By Fons Haffmans
GSO Vice President

The West Campus Academic Plan was released by Provost Tilden Edelstein on April 13. Subsequently, it was discussed in

basically has to give this money back although the administration is again using IDC-funds to finance the budget deficit. In effect the HFA division is asked to cut back so the administration can fund other divisions.

ships... are generally not recognized as significant assets to the research environment." It also proposed to use \$1 million to change GA-lines into fellowships. It may indeed be the case that

Viewpoints

Phuck Philosophy: Admin's Divide and Conquer Tactics

By Robert V. Gilheany

Stony Brook has long held a reputation for having one of the finest Philosophy departments in the country. Over the past ten months, however, the administration, aided and abetted by Dean of Humanities and Fine Arts Patrick Heelan, has maneuvered a political "Gang of Four" disgruntled professors into control of the department. The results have been a year of strife and controversy for both faculty and graduate students.

Last August, the administration removed the elected department chair, Donn Welton, and replaced him with David Dilworth. This was done without consulting faculty members in the department. According to a University Senate resolution dated February 10, 1992, the administration had no justification for its failure to consult the department's faculty in regard to either Welton's removal or the placement of Dilworth as acting chair of the department.

The administration's selection of Dilworth as acting chair was Dean Heelan's way of picking a henchman to do the administration's dirty work. Since Dilworth took over, there has been a freeze on hiring and promotions, and certain faculty members have been targeted for firing in an attempt

to downsize the department. This semester, nine professors from the department signed a letter to the editor of the American Philosophy Association's journal which discussed the conflict in the department. The letter clearly stated that the conflict was not the result of clashing philosophical traditions but a fight over self-determination within the department.

This conflict pits Heelan and a few professors against virtually the entire faculty and most graduate students. The letter pointed out that its signatories represented a cross-section of professors with differing philosophical styles who were committed to keeping Stony Brook a place where different philosophical traditions could meet. It stated, "We feel that the abuses of [Heelan and the administration], including harassment of faculty and staff and improper administrative handling of a tenure case, have followed as a result."

The grievances laid out had to do with the removal of Welton and the imposition of Dilworth without consultation, the downsizing of the analytic wing of the department, the targeted firing of Professor Peter Ludlow, and the top-down approach the administration is taking to impose its will on the department. The department wants to choose its own chair, while the administration wants to select someone from

outside of the university.

Dilworth responded harshly to the APA journal letter. In a letter to the department's faculty and students, he charged the signatories with bringing disgrace to the department and said that "their Scud [missile] has reached the profession at large." He called the charges untrue and said the writers had "poisoned the well" and betrayed the department's reputation. The faculty members said they had written the letter to dispel any notion that the strife was in any way related to the different philosophical traditions in the department.

Citing the discord within the department, Dilworth then recommended that the department not receive any tuition reimbursement funds for its doctoral program. He said that the environment in the department had deteriorated so badly that any excess tuition funds should not go to it until the educational environment improved. Heelan agreed with Dilworth on withholding support for new graduate student teaching assistants in the department.

The Graduate Student Employees Union responded, in a letter to Heelan, by saying they were shocked that the chairman of the Philosophy Department would advocate withholding funds for his department. They GSEU said it felt graduate students were being made victims of a fight between the faculty and the administration, and declared Dilworth's actions "directed against graduate students to be short-sighted and offensive to the university community."

The faculty had responded to the crisis of self-determination by proposing a slate of candidates to administer the department. The chosen professors who represented the various disciplines in the department and also divided their selections along gender lines. In a letter to his colleagues in the department, Professor Ed Casey said he feared the administration would put the department in receivership, and advocated the slate proposal as the only way the department could survive with its graduate program intact. Casey, who was selected as a member of this committee, said none of the people had asked to be put on it, or were doing it for personal gain. He also said he would much rather be teaching and writing.

The slate consisted of Casey as chair; Eva Kittay as director of graduate studies; Walter Watson, Rita Nolan, and Lee Miller as directors of undergraduate studies; Mary Rawlinson in charge of placement; and Bob Crease in charge of Colloquiums/Research. The faculty voted for the slate proposal by a huge margin (15-4), with one abstention. The department's graduate student body sent a letter to the university community stating that the slate had their support.

The students also countered Provost Tilden Edelstein's comments on not accepting new graduate students with support because of the discord in the department by citing the vote as a sign of a unified department that had come up with a reasonable solution to the strife that was plaguing the department. They also slammed Dilworth, saying that they had no confidence in his ability to administer the department, and stated they believed the myth that the department was in "disarray" was being used by the administration to impose its will on the department.

Dilworth responded to the graduate students with a terse letter, accusing them of "sophomoric demagoguery" and calling their letter a "pathetic denouement."

At the most recent departmental meeting, Edelstein opened by objecting to the presence of graduate students at the meeting. He then proceeded to make veiled threats toward the faculty, saying that receivership, as well as an audit of the department, was being considered. At this point Professor Ken Baynes interrupted, saying he was leaving because he was surprised by Edelstein's tone and he didn't appreciate the fact that the department's faculty were being treated like children, adding that a 15-4-1 vote for the slate was a strong consensus.

There were attempts to arrive at unanimity, such as tinkering with the slate proposal, but nothing acceptable to the majority would appease the "Gang of Four" opposed to this slate. Professor Hugh Silverman, one of the dissenters, suggested a slate with Dilworth as chair. That went over like a lead balloon. Ludlow said he would rather take a direct nuclear hit than accept that prospect. Professors Gary Mar and Baynes reportedly said that Dilworth's handling of their appointments was unprofessional and incompetent.

Deadlock continues to grip the department. Time will tell if the democratic process will prevail.

Rob Gilheany received his Bachelors' degree from Stony Brook last December. This viewpoint was written based on interviews with graduate students in the department.

Edelstein's Majority of One

By Robert Mahoney

Democracy is supposedly the animating principle of our society, and this principle is ultimately about equal access to and participation in the *dialogue*, no matter how raucous, that is essential to any rational process of decision. This means that democracy is also ultimately about *voting* on one position or another, when that dialogue has failed to produce a single comprehensive position that can be unanimously agreed upon, and *respecting*, if not the majority position of the moment, at least the democratic process that produced it. Few of us, therefore, should fail to be suspicious, fearful, or even thoroughly outraged when a single individual or cabal, in a position of power, suspends democracy on the basis that they know best what is the interest of society. We should not fail to have any or all of these reactions, for such an act constitutes the first condition of *tyranny*.

Should it come as a surprise, then, that Stony Brook's provost, Tilden Edelstein, was met with precisely these feelings when he declared that he regards a "16 to 4 vote (Edelstein's count; the actual tally was 15-4-1)" as being a "tyranny of the majority," and thus, just cause for putting a university department into receivership? No. For democracy would be nothing more than an alibi for a society or state founded upon undemocratic, tyrannical institutions.

Edelstein was responding to a question put forth by a graduate student from the Philosophy department at an "Open Town Meeting," sponsored by the GSO, which I attended on April 16. The purpose of this meeting was to address the potentially devastating effects of the state's budget cuts on graduate education at Stony Brook. Edelstein was attempting to justify a cut of 125 teaching and graduate assistant lines, which represents more than \$1 million in graduate student funding, when this understandably concerned graduate student inquired as to why her department seemed to be under direct attack by him, as he is refusing to allow any new graduate students into the Philosophy department regardless of whether the university needs to fund them. Edelstein made it clear that he views the democratic process in the Philosophy department as contentious and, therefore, as an obstacle to his vision of efficient administration, or "professionalism" and "collegiality." He unequivocally reaffirmed this position in a May 6 meeting with the Philosophy department faculty, a meeting from which he expelled the official graduate student representative.

It is no accident that Edelstein should single out the Philosophy department for administrative attack during an economic crisis, nor that he should try to justify his contempt for democracy by reference to these two notions. This is because "efficient administration" and "collegiality" bespeak an outmoded model of organization that is continually demonstrating its profound opposition to the two ideas that philosophy embodies, namely Reason and dialogue, the cornerstones of democracy. Edelstein's cherished notion of collegiality refers to the Roman Catholic Church's doctrine of hierarchical organization, which serves as the historical, totalitarian ideal of all modern-day bureaucracies in govern-

ment, business and, unfortunately, education. Ironically, however, at a time when the rest of the industrialized world is more or less painfully abandoning the bureaucratic model because they have realized its ethical corruption and long-term sterility, and are developing lateral forms of organization which require greater democracy and foster individual responsibility, our leaders in education, business, and politics seem bent on clinging to these models of tyranny and hastening the U.S.'s demise, even though lateral forms of organization are presently proving far more human and efficient, i.e. the Japanese system of *lean production*.

The appearance of tyrants, however, is not a sufficient condition for the establishment or preservation of tyrannies, which brings me to the collective response of the graduate students in the Philosophy department to Edelstein's intolerable position. On April 20, one of them suggested that the only appropriate and potentially effective response would be for the graduate students in the department to go on strike, and attempt to persuade graduate students in other departments to join them, since their departments would most likely be next on the administration's hit list if they failed to conform with the provost's vision of collegiality. As objectionable as Edelstein's action was to them, however, the general sentiment was that democracy is "too abstract a principle" to warrant such strong action, and it would probably be safer to write a public memorandum declaring their support for the "democratic process" in the department and university, while putting their practical efforts into lobbying for a benevolent receiver to take over their department. In other words, individuals who supposedly set out to devote their lives to the study, development, and defense of the very basis of democracy chose instead to accept the premises of tyranny, thus establishing the sufficient condition for its existence in their university and its continued survival in our society.

No doubt, these would-be philosophers forgot the words of one of their predecessors at his trial in 399 B.C.: "But perhaps someone will say 'Do you feel no compunction, Socrates, at having followed a line of action which puts you in danger of the death penalty?' I might fairly reply to him, You are mistaken, my friend, if you think that a man who is worth anything ought to spend his time weighing up the prospects of life and death. He has only one thing to consider in performing any action; that is, whether he is acting rightly, or wrongly, like a good man, or a bad one (*Apology*)." Socrates may not have been a democrat in the ancient sense of the word. However, he realized that true self-interest lies in *right action*, and that *the good* is only as concrete as one is willing to make it. Thus, he chose death to ensure the practicality of the two activities which give democracy life-- Reason and dialogue.

Tyranny can only succeed on the backs of ignorance, cowardice, and would-be tyrants. Let us hope that the graduate students at Stony Brook, realize this before it is too late.

Robert Mahoney is a doctoral candidate in Political Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

International Student Spotlight

Foreign Student Services Advisory

By Lynn King Morris
Foreign Student Advisor

Congratulations to all the May and August graduates. May you find success and happiness!

If you are looking for a place to spend an idyllic afternoon, Planting Fields (the Coe Arboretum) is at the height of its glory for azaleas and rhododendrons this weekend. The first home of SUNY at Stony Brook, Planting Fields is located off Route 25A, on Mill River Road in Muttontown (about 45 minutes by car, open 9 AM to 5 PM). Consult your road maps for complete directions or call 922-9200. The entry fee is only \$3.00 for each car, and visitors can walk through the gardens, picnic on the spacious lawn, admire the greenhouses, and, for a small additional fee, visit the Coe Mansion. The guided tours are wonderful. Right now the lilac walk and the azaleas and rhododendrons are beautiful. Later on the rose gardens, the iris gardens, and the synoptic gardens (plants arranged in alphabetical order by name), become outstanding.

This weekend and next the gardens are hosting a Mozart festival. There are concerts at 2 PM and at sundown. On Sunday afternoon, May 31, a dressage (dances by specially trained horses) to the music of Mozart will be presented.

Reminders About Status and Travel

Expiration of Status: Students whose I-20's are expiring in May or August must extend them BEFORE the expiration date, within the thirty days prior to the expiration date. There is no longer any grace period. The applications

include a request for a new I-20 (a new financial affidavit is needed), a precise letter of recommendation (a form is now available), the old I-20, and a completed I-538.

Students who cannot get an appropriate recommendation letter or who miss the filing date must file for REINSTATEMENT. Instructions are available in FSS. For reinstatement, a fee of \$70.00 is collected by INS. Students may not accept employment or stipends while out of status or waiting for reinstatement.

Change of Program: Students who are changing from one program to another or one level to another are reminded that simply receiving the I-20 is not enough. FSS must APPROVE the change. When you receive your new I-20, visit FSS to get the paperwork processed.

Departure: You won't have any difficulty departing the U.S. Please sign out at FSS. If you have graduated and are returning home for good, remember that you should get a SAILING PERMIT from the Internal Revenue Service before you leave. They will arrange for you to receive the money you are due from overwithholding from your stipend check. Upon leaving the U.S. you will be asked to return your I-94 (the little white card in your passport). If you don't have it for any reason, simply sign a paper stating the reason.

Re-entry: In order to return to the U.S. to continue school, you will need a valid passport, a valid visa, an I-20 with a current validation signature on the back, and, if possible, a letter of good standing from your department.

Students from the People's Republic of China (PRC), former U.S.S.R. countries, and some other Eastern European countries may be eligible for pre-approval for new visas. Pick up detailed instructions at FSS.

PRC students with expired visas and who were here and in status prior to April 11, 1990, may apply for and receive a permit from New York INS which allows them to leave and re-enter without applying for new visas in China. That is called PAROLE. Detailed instructions are available in FSS.

Orientation: FSS needs volunteers for orientation, beginning August 24, 1992. Make new friends, serve your university and your colleagues. Have a little fun and feel good about yourself all at the same time. We are particularly interested in contacting students from India Association, Korean Association, Sinorama, and the Chinese Associations, since over 60% of our new students are arriving from those four countries. Call Sumeet at 2-7025.

Overdue Bills: Please settle up your accounts with the University. If we are seen as a liability rather than an asset, I have trouble lobbying for your interests and helping students with real financial emergencies.

Summer Employment: Two kinds of off-campus employment permission are available for students who are still enrolled: curricular practical training and the Pilot Program. Please pick up information at FSS if you are interested. You or your departments are expected to locate your own employers/sponsors.

Deadlines: The deadline for post-completion practical training applications for May graduation is June 15. The deadline for post-completion practical training applications for August graduation is September 14. Since you can apply for the recommendation up to three months prior to your graduation, please consider applying early!

Have a nice summer!!!

The editor
of this
esteemed publication
would like to thank
all the
international students,
and especially
the Office of
Foreign Student Services,
for their
contributions
to this space.
Farewell!

Chinese Library Open to the Public

By Peicheng Hu

Stony Brook Mainland China Students Association

With the hard efforts and preparation over a long time, a Chinese library of books, newspapers, and magazines has opened to the public in Room S209 of the Social and Behavioral Sciences building. Since the opening, it has been warmly received and greatly used by Chinese students, visiting scholars, and people who are just interested in Chinese culture.

There are thousands of books and more than 40 different newspapers and magazines in the library, including the *People's Daily*, *Bright Daily*, *Science Pictorial*, *Public Movie*, *New Sports*, and so on.

After reading in the library, one student said, "I often want to read Chinese newspapers and magazine, otherwise, the life is too monotonous and uninteresting. A lot of magazines are lovely to read for me. I hope that this library is kept open continuously."

For the purpose of serving Chinese students and scholars, we hope to make the library work well. We welcome more and more people who are interested in Chinese traditions and culture to come and enjoy themselves.

The library is open from 2 to 4 PM on Wednesdays over the summer.

The International Student Spotlight is a special section devoted to items of interest to international graduate students and those who would like to learn about the international-student community at Stony Brook. We invite all organizations to submit material for this section, and we can print brief notices in languages besides English. But we need your input. Call 632-6492 if you would like to write something or publicize an event that your organization is sponsoring.

News and Blues from the Network

All material captured and forwarded by Fred "Steady Freddy" Mayer

Brown University Busts 253 Student Protestors

On April 22, 1992, what began as a student sit-in at 8:30 AM ended as a takeover with 253 being arrested at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island. The students invaded University Hall, Brown's main administration building to protest the University's need-aware admissions policy. These actions were the result of months of work by Students for Minority Aid & Admissions (SAMA).

The students were arrested by Providence (municipal) Police and originally were going to be charged w/5 misdemeanors at the University's insistence: disorderly conduct, willful interference with employment, disturbing the peace, & two willful trespass charges. At this date three of those charges have been dropped.

The following newspaper article outlines the students' legal representation.

Brown Students Near Accord, Lawyer Says
Arraignments Set for 253 Arrested in Admissions Protest
By D. Morgan McVicar

Journal-Bulletin Education Writer

PROVIDENCE -- A lawyer for 253 Brown University students

arrested last week after they took over the administration building met with Brown lawyers over the weekend and said yesterday that he thinks "the matter will be resolved very quickly."

Martin Garbus of New York, one of the nation's experts in civil liberty law, met Saturday with leaders of the group that led a series of protests last week, and agreed to represent them. The students are to be arraigned tomorrow in District Court on two misdemeanor charges each.

"I think these are committed students who are involved in a very important issue, and I think I can play a role," said Garbus, whose daughter, Elizabeth, is a Brown senior. She was not among those arrested.

That issue is Brown's admissions policy which takes into account students' ability to pay and has resulted, many students say, in inadequate minority representation on campus.

The group, Students for Aid and Minority Admission, is demanding that Brown adopt a "need-blind" admissions policy, by which the most qualified applicants would be accepted and all those needing help paying tuition would receive it. As a step toward that policy, SAMA wants Brown to increase its financial

aid goal in its recently launched \$450 million capital campaign from \$40 million to \$90 million.

Brown says the goal was set after years of study, and to raise it would be unrealistic.

Garbus said his discussions with Brown lawyers could be "possibly fruitful," but that if the university does not agree to drop charges, he thinks he has a good shot at getting acquittals. Garbus, 57, has represented political dissidents and victims of state security in Europe, Africa, Asia, Latin American and the U.S. He has represented comedian Lenny Bruce, drug guru Dr. Timothy Leary and Russian dissidents Andrei Sakharov and Natan Sharansky.

Garbus said that Leonard I. Weinglass, another New York civil liberties lawyer he has worked with often (and who was a lawyer for the Chicago Seven), is also working on the case. Both are working without charge. A third New York lawyer, Michael Ratner, has offered his services. Ratner and Weinglass are expected to meet with students tonight.

Reprinted without permission from the Providence Journal-Bulletin, 4/28/92.

Perot: Snake-oil Salesman for President?

By Joyce Chediac
Workers World Service

Can a billionaire win the votes of working and middle class people? One seems to think so. His name is H. [for Henry] Ross Perot, Texas multi-millionaire who would be President.

A long-time rightwing Republican, he now calls himself a "newcomer" and talks of "Republican dirty tricksters" and the "rotten system."

What does he stand for? Perot is among the richest of the rich, but says it's "obscene to have the gap between the factory floor and the corner office that we have."

Perot claims that \$180 billion could be saved in the federal budget by stopping "waste, fraud and abuse," but doesn't say whether he would tax the banks or scapegoat welfare recipients. He admits to belonging to clubs that exclude Black and Jewish people, but also claims that he does not oppose a woman's right to choose abortion.

His political pronouncements are contradictory or vague. His appeal is more calculated to rest in his image, as an outsider to government and big business, and an independent alternative to the Democratic and Republican Party candidates and machines.

"The day I made Eagle Scout was more important to me than the day I discovered I was a billionaire," he says. Yet Perot is not running his election campaign with scout badges alone. With the image as the message and a personal fortune of \$2.5 to \$3.5 billion behind him, Perot is building his own electoral machine to petition for ballot status in all 50 states.

Other independent candidates get little or no media coverage. Perot's squeaky clean smile peers out from the cover of Newsweek and the front page of the New York Times. His "straight shooting" words can be heard on the networks.

With this boost from the media, people are listening. According to a March Los Angeles Times poll of 1,521 voters nationwide, 21 percent would vote for Perot as compared to 37 percent for Bush and 35 percent for Clinton.

But a closer look at Perot's background reveals that he is not what he says he is. Perot is a billionaire boss and a right-wing demagogue. He cannot speak to the needs of those struggling to find jobs, to make car or house rent payments, to find decent health coverage, or afford the next meal.

No "Outsider"

Far from being an "outsider," this multi-billionaire has been intimately connected to both Republican and Democratic Party administrations, and has strong ties to the military, the Wall Street banks, and the very government apparatus he claims to oppose.

Perot knows a lot about party politics. He has been a long-time rightwing Republican. His public political life began in 1969 when, at the request of the Nixon administration, Perot hired jets and tried to airlift supplies to U.S. POWs in Vietnam. Later, he organized anti-Vietnamese protests in South East Asia.

Thus, Perot played a key role in launching the POW issue into the world media. This issue has been used by Democratic and Republican administrations alike to batter the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Ten years later, with the knowledge of the government, he organized a private team of former Green Beret commandos to go into Iran and rescue two of his Electronic Data Systems Corp. employees jailed during the Iranian Revolution.

Perot actually sat on confidential military consulting committees for both the Carter and Reagan administrations. This is documented in the book "The Iran-Contra Connection: Secret Teams and Covert Operations in the Reagan Era," by J. Marshall, P. Scott and J. Hunter.

During the Carter administration, Perot was on Zbigniew Brzezinski's "military committee," which advised on the disastrous U.S. military intervention in Iran in 1980. Later, Reagan made Perot part of his Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

The same book also links Perot to Oliver North, and thus to the Iran-Contra scandal. Perot is connected to two unsuccessful attempts by Oliver North to ransom military and CIA personnel held in Italy and Lebanon.

For more than two decades, Perot has been right in there with all the forces he claims to oppose. In short, Perot is a demagogue. But his manufactured image as an "independent" and "outsider" has struck a chord especially with middle class people who have been hard hit by the recession, and with some working people as well.

Perot's real record shows that his "actions" have everything to do with bolstering the most rightwing elements, and nothing to do with providing jobs and social services. In fact, when Perot headed a commission to overhaul the Texas schools in 1984, most of the teachers who lost their jobs as a result of his suggestions were black women.

Self-made, With Government Projects

Perot is fond of pointing out that he is a self-made man. In 1962 with only \$1,000, he formed Electronic Data Systems Corporation, which designed, installed and operated data processing systems.

With Perot's guidance, the story goes, EDS grew into a multi-billion dollar corporation. Perot does not mention that he made his money through contracts with the very giant corporations, banks and government apparatus he now pooh-poohs.

Perot made his first big bucks on computer projects for big insurance companies, like Blue Cross. EDS rapidly expanded into the banking sector, and soon became the largest processor of credit union accounts in the country.

What really pushed EDS into the major leagues, however, was the federal government's passage of the Medicare bill in 1965. This dramatically increased the number of claims processed by the health-care system. In fact, most of Perot's billions have come from the government he now distances himself from.

In the early 1980s, EDS began to focus on "megacontracts" from the federal government. In 1981 it won a contract for Project Viable, a \$656 million, ten-year program to overhaul the computer systems at 47 army bases. Part of the contract called for EDS to train 60,000 army personnel. EDS also pursued huge contracts with the Social Security Administration and the U.S. Postal Service.

In short, Perot is intimate with and beholden to the traditional establishment old boy network and the government for his billions.

"Independence" is the word that has attracted many to Perot, and in truth, it is the key word. But what is needed is class independence, a party free of binding ties to Wall Street, the banks, the military industrial complex that Perot is so much a part of.

In order to get their needs met, the working and oppressed people of this country need their own independent party.

U.S. Blows Up Another Nuke At Nevada Site

The second nuclear test of 1992 "Diamond Fortune" took place this morning at 9:30 AM Pacific time on Rainier Mesa within the Nevada Test Site. The unannounced nuclear explosion was conducted jointly by Los Alamos National Laboratories and the Department of Defense.

Diamond Fortune was a weapons effects test designed to test military, electronic and communications equipment under a simulated nuclear explosion. The test took place in a horizontal tunnel and had a yield of less than 20 kts. No seismographic reading of the test is available yet.

This was the 938th nuclear explosion conducted by the United States since 1945. The last test "Junction" took place on March 26, 1992.

Despite moratoriums on nuclear testing by France and Russia the United States is still planning on continuing its weapons testing program with at least 3 more scheduled nuclear tests at the Nevada test site.



GSO Response to Provost's Academic Plan—

(Continued from Page 3)

The original "draft academic plan" put great emphasis on expanding undergraduate teaching by organizing a comprehensive evening program. Enrollment-- so the reasoning went-- would increase. If Stony Brook exceeded its enrollment it would be allowed to keep its "extra" tuition. The budget plan currently envisions that this will net Stony Brook \$100,000. One can realistically ask whether this is worth the trouble.

Research Funding

An unstated but important assumption underlying the plan is the need to diversify Stony Brook's funding sources. In practice, this means an increase in sponsored research by either the federal government or industry. This will increase possible sources of graduate student funding and, in addition, the Indirect Costs help alleviate some of the university's operating expenses. Funding from industry could be obtained more effectively if principal investigators in a department undertake such an effort on their own. The role of the administration should be to support such efforts. To get some idea of where Stony Brook stands in research funding it is compared to its peer institutions. The relevant parameter is "Federal Research Dollars per Faculty" in table 2.

TABLE 2

FEDERAL DOLLARS [units of \$100.=]

Institution	Per Faculty
Stony Brook	25.8
Univ. of Rochester	75.5
Duke	34.9
Stanford	181.0
U. of Pennsylvania	34.5
U. of Virginia	23.2
U. of Pittsburgh	29.9
UC San Diego	126.7
SUNY Buffalo	16.1
U. of Iowa	41.5
U. of Washington	79.7
U. of Michigan	53.2
UCLA	52.6
Ohio State Univ.	19.1

Stony Brook still lags far behind its peers in securing research funding. Incentives to increase research funding should be part of any long-term financial plan.

Non-academic Areas

The Gelber report implies that the non-academic areas have grown substantially compared to the academic area. The Presi-

dent has released his response to the Gelber committee on this point. The President has concurred with the Gelber committee for all intents and purposes. He attributes the growth for a significant part to the Hospital Operations. In addition, the President has mentioned in one of his reports that "nearly every other measure of campus activity increased explosively this period including [...] cultural events, and performances, student food service, athletic events, and other student and community-oriented activities." The President also seems to support the Gelber committee's intuition of a bloated financially unaccountable service sector when he writes: "...related and internal audit

and control activities have indicated the need for improved accounting for operations that charge services or have other forms of revenue. Preliminary analysis does indicate that savings are available in the GA/GIS [General Administrative/General Institutional Services] areas with appropriate changes in the technology and organization of work." Currently the so-called GA/GIS initiative is being completed to streamline the administration.

Acknowledgements: In writing this response I have benefitted from discussions with Jane Ely, Gary Halada, Patricia Hubbard, Kathryn Kent, Rob Kirkman, Monica McTigue, Tom Pepper, John Reinfelder and Jean Rousseau.

Paradoxes in Academia and Politics: A Symbolic Reflection of History

By Kiumars Lalezar

Department of Psychology

The question I am raising here is : Should academia be contaminated by politics?

But before this issue can be touched on, a reflection on history is appropriate. After Rome's organization disintegrated and its power turned into decadence, the cities regressed, the roads were empty of trade, the Germanic influence progressively crept across the frontiers and the Pagan culture was receptive to Oriental cults. From then on, the Roman empire was transformed into papacy. By the 1200s, the church and its power and autocracy nurtured by the emperors grew.

Through all this, philosophy which was associated with faith struggled to move towards reason and away from pre-ordained conclusions. But the Thomas Aquinas atmosphere dissolved the Aristotelian reason into the pre-operational stage until the crusades brought light from the east with the wealth of luxuries, heresies, alcohol, mathematics, drugs, dyes, building techniques, and chemistry. Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek writings were translated. Paper was imported from Egypt and printing was flourished. This allowed learning not be limited to those who had access to costly parchment which had made learning the monopoly of the priests. Liberation and knowledge spread across the seas.

Monasteries and universities of Italy and France started organized search from astrology to astronomy, from alchemy to chemistry, and from speaking animals to zoology. The age of enlightenment reached its peak with the astronomy of Copernicus and Galileo, Gilbert's work on magnetism and electricity, Harvey's work on circulation of the blood, Vasalius' work on anatomy, and Voltaire; all of whom were emotionally or physically exiled by the autocracy at the time.

Francis Bacon was among these scholars who after three years

of study at Trinity College rebelled against the Aristotelian and Socratic method and became a materialist by diverting into politics in the hope of incrementing the human good. His vision for restructuring did not actualize. Since much as in tragedies marked by burning of Alexandrian library in the previous centuries, around the time that the French were creating the variables for their revolution, the Germans were docile, and the Italians were revolting, around the 1750s encyclopedias were being burned. Even though the burning of Rousseau's "Emile" ("a plea for progressive education") made the envious Didorite happy, the philosophic community were "petite troupe".

They were receptive to modernity, antiquity, and science. John Locke in the 1600s had already spread his popular "equality of humans" statements and the European society was raising to capitalism. In the second half of 18th century, the semantics were "utility" oriented and the leaders were "atheists". Through all this, a Platonic undertone was emerging (i.e., who will watch the workers?). A domestic animal had to accept sameness, routine, and closeness. Some accepted some did not. Self-alienation, sadness, loneliness, and the standard of living began to increase in the name of individualism. However, the result was not higher "quality" of living.

This past month marked another epoch in our history. At the time when basic needs such as health insurance has to have been solved, we are still dealing with inequality and symbolic revolutions. Education is contaminated with political pressure. Learning motivation is contaminated with non-sacred issues of power inevitable in any political discourse. Graduate students are seeing themselves as "underpaid-uninsured workers" (far from working to catalogue another star!). Are these events a regression in time or mere historic flash backs brought about by food deprivation or evolution taking a backward spin?

GSA Corner

Please Read This:

Your Health and Paycheck Are At Risk

By Tom Pepper

Graduate Student Advocate

The Graduate School has recently learned that there could be a problem with infirmary care during the summer. Most graduate students who have work study jobs or summer teaching jobs must register for a no-credit summer course, for which they do not pay, during the summer; however, since they are not registered for any credits, student accounts will not inform them that IF THEY DO NOT PAY A HEALTH FEE OF THIRTY DOLLARS, THEY CANNOT USE THE INFIRMARY DURING THE SUMMER. All students MUST check with their departments concerning registering for the summer, or else they WILL NOT GET PAID. They must also make sure to pay the fee at the infirmary, not at student accounts, if they want to use the infirmary during the summer. Sorry for the typographical histrionics, but this is extremely important for graduate student survival over the summer.

A second point: the Affirmative Action Office is proposing a sexual harassment policy specifically for the graduate students. The Graduate Council will be working on it over the summer, and it may be important for the GSO (Execs at least) to make some input into the proposal as well. Any graduate students who are concerned can let me know, and I will give them a copy of the draft proposal.

It has been a hell of a year. Next year promises to be worse. Dasvidanya.

Attention:

Graduate Students
wishing to pick up their
departmental allocations
must do so by July 31
or lose them!!!

Call Ida at 632-6492 for
more information.

S h o r t T a k e s

And Last Licks.....

Legislation Introduced to Grant Police Powers to Public Safety

A bill that would grant police powers to SUNY Public Safety officers-- automatically giving them the right to carry guns on duty-- has been introduced on the floor of the New York State Senate.

The bill has the support of the Security and Law Enforcement Employees Council 82, the union representing Public Safety employees. Under existing legislation, Public Safety officers are legally referred to as peace officers. As such, they have most powers that police officers have, except they aren't automatically entitled to carry a weapon or to "stop and frisk." Currently, the power to arm public safety officers lies with the president of each campus. In order to carry a weapon, a Public Safety officer would need to get a gun permit.

If this legislation is adopted, Public Safety officers would automatically be entitled to carry guns. Council 82 has taken the position that arming Public Safety is necessary to secure the safety on the job of its members.

--Haffmans

Academic Plan Released--

(Continued from Page 1)

summarized in Table 1. In addition to these changes in funding, all department budgets will be reduced by 3.3% resulting in a total cut of \$1.6 million.

TABLE 1

DIVISION	Cut	Commitment	Net
Physical Sci. and Math.	\$54,350	---	-\$ 54,350
Biological Sciences	\$128,091	\$ 90,000	+\$ 90,000
Humanities and Fine Arts	\$232,200	---	-\$232,200
Soc. and Behav. Sciences	---	\$ 51,000	+\$ 51,000
Engineering & Applied Sci.	\$393,833	\$554,100	+\$160,267
Marine Sciences	---	\$245,000	+\$245,000
Harriman	---	---	---

Cut refers to the decrease in one-time funding

The Provost suggests in his plan that departments meet this reduction by cutting clerical staff and increasing early retirements.

As was mentioned in the last issue of the *News and Blues*, support to graduate students was cut by \$1 million. The stated intent was to reduce funding for incoming students. However, it should be clear that the funding of returning students is under fire as well, given the magnitude of the cut in some divisions and departments.

Additional Resources

To meet the budget deficit the Provost intends to increase revenues by \$1.6 million. Most of that money (\$1.2 million) is derived from the indirect cost (IDC) paid to the university. Indirect costs are the overhead cost reimbursements that research sponsors pay to the university. An additional source of revenue is the tuition income fund (TIFR). If more students enroll than the campus had planned for, it would be allowed to retain part of the extra tuition. Furthermore, the campus is providing the Research Foundation with administrative assistance. In the future, the Research Foundation will be charged for those services. Some additional revenue is expected to come from private fundraising in divisions or departments, notably a closer collaboration between private industry and the university.

Nothing New

Much of the final version of the academic plan seems to follow the Provost's earlier plan. Changes to the earlier draft include the announcement that there will be no academic restructuring next Fall, and both Technology and Society and International Programs will continue operating as independent programs. A second announcement is that foreign students may be charged a user fee for visa services in the future. In addition, the Provost clearly states that he intends to restore the \$1 million cut to graduate education next year. Furthermore, he promises recommendations regarding graduate student support that are likely to have significant resource implications.

Support the Fresh Air Fund

REMINDER:

University Imposes New Summer Health Fee

For the first time, the University at Stony Brook will be imposing a summer health fee on all students registered for credit during the summer of 1992. This fee will be \$30 for ALL students, graduate and undergraduate, full-time and part-time.

Graduate students registering for the zero-credit 800 level courses will not have to pay the health fee, but they will not be allowed to use the infirmary *UNLESS* they pay the fee. Students registering for 800-level courses will not be billed for the health fee from Student Accounts, but if they wish to use the Infirmary, they must go to the Infirmary and pay the \$30 fee there. Call 632-6740 for additional information.

Last Lick:

I came to the GSO as Treasurer in the fall of 1987, the semester after the great GSO/grad student work stoppages and the Tent City housing protest which grew out of those actions. It was a heady year: we had just won major concessions from the administration (minimum stipend raise from \$6,000 to \$7,150; \$50,000 contribution to subsidize child care for low-income parents; a fair, uniform grievance procedure), and over 30 students had been arrested for exercising their right to protest against the university's slums and outrageous housing costs. I remember feeling there was nothing we couldn't do, so long as we educated our constituents and our cause was just.

In the Spring of 1988, I helped coordinate the only (to my knowledge) rent strike in SUNY's history, as hundreds of Chapin residents-- most of them international students-- deposited more than \$67,000 into an escrow account, following months of fruitless negotiations regarding a proposed rent increase and the horrendous conditions of the apartments there. We turned a 10% increase into a 3% increase before releasing the funds, and that fall, the multi-million dollar renovation project began in Chapin. But by the Spring of 1989, little had changed there besides the cosmetic additions of vinyl siding; the university was again proposing a big rent increase, and students again went on a rent strike. This time more than \$85,000 went into escrow before the strike was settled.

I give you this brief history not to toot my own horn, for I merely helped channel the anger into action, but to remind those who have not been here long that this was once an activist campus. When we realized we were powerless to effect change by working within the system, we went outside it, and twisted it into knots until we got what we wanted. We actually got some perverse form of pleasure from watching three-piece-suits twist in the wind. We didn't always succeed, but we learned a lot and had a great deal of fun doing it. I still count many of the people I worked with among my dearest friends.

We are entering a phase where graduate students will have to stand up again for their rights-- both within the system and, perhaps, by attacking it. I am almost 30 (about the median age for grad students, I suppose), and I still feel like a child when dealing with the administration. I suppose paternalism goes with the job; it doesn't help that the higher administration at Stony Brook is, for the most part, made up of older, white men. It reflects the white, conservative demographics of the university's location.

A new executive council takes office this summer. With it will come new perspectives and new ideas for action. It is my sincere hope that graduate students will realize the solution to fighting their oppression lies both by working cordially with-- though separately from-- the administration, and by being prepared to go up against it. One of my most poignant memories of Stony Brook will always be seeing the long line of Chapin residents standing in front of the Administration building, waiting for over an hour to sign their rent checks into the escrow account the GSO had helped set up. They and others faced expulsion, possible withdrawal of visa status, and loss of their GA, TA, or RA lines. We must remember their selfless sacrifice, and be prepared to join them again.

See you there....

George Rieberman