

"We Have No Trombones ..."

"We got trouble right here in River City, With a capital T, and that rhymes with P And that stands for Pool..."—The Music Man
The other day a professor was walking the halls in the Science building, muttering to himself, "...we've got trouble..." He was answered by a student wit, "Do you mean 'with a capital T, and that rhymes with P, and that stands for Pool...?'"

To that remark the professor retorted, "Except that we have no trombones to fall back on..."

Realistically, the professor could have been referring to the financial plight of this college. Consider the current national situation: First, the U.S. government is cutting back on its budget for 1980-81. One of the most likely cuts will come in the area of student loans, particularly those at the lowest interest rates. Second, the impending recession is causing many businessmen and women to cut back on their business and personal spending. Thus, those with college-age children are probably going to encourage them to attend relatively prestigious—and dramatically less expensive—state universities. Third, banks are increasingly reluctant to finance individual college loans. The loans which are approved will have interest rates in the neighborhood of fifteen per cent. Many parents are willing to go deeply into debt to send a young fellow or a young lady to Harvard, Princeton, or Emory. Realistically, however, it is difficult to imagine parents who are equally willing to go into debt for a less prestigious school such as St. Andrews. Fourth, if a school such as St. Andrews has a substantial part of its endowment invested in stocks, then inflation would eat significantly into the endowment principle. On the other hand, if much of the endowment has been invested in bonds, then recent high interest rates would have made the return on the investment intolerably small compared to the return on

such investment items such as Treasury bills (6½ per cent, as opposed to 14 per cent for the Treasury bills).

There is some evidence that these problems may be seriously affecting the college right now. In the admissions office, approximately one-half of the staff is no longer there for one reason or another. Admissions for next year are down. Dudley Crawford is not publicly pessimistic. He admits that recruiting is "down a little bit," but the incoming class may be down by twenty to thirty per cent from this year, according to some who have seen the early figures. In the business office, the business manager Richard Lank is leaving the college abruptly. He has complained recently that the college is suffering from a severe cash-flow problem. He has even quoted an alarming figure—in excess of \$70,000—as the current outstanding debt of the college. Lank has admitted to leaving "in a huff."

It would be easy to blame individuals for problems here at the college, but that would fail to address the actual, serious financial problems. These problems have been brought about by a combination of unfortunate factors, many of which are beyond the control of anyone here at St. Andrews. Of course, there are probably several steps which could have been taken to soften the impact of this financial crisis. However, if the college community decides to solve the problems by beginning a "search to find the culprit," then a situation may develop in which administrative and student differences will prevent the college from looking for some reasonable and long-term financial solutions.

As Benjamin Franklin once said, "We must all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

Finally, as one staff member observed, "If the students feel that this problem is foreign to their concerns, they are sadly mistaken."

Crisis: Carter Faces Foreign Policy

For the moment here is a deep sadness in America over the tragic failure of our rescue mission in Iran last Friday. Early polls show broad support for the President's action in spite of its failure. Still, the damage to America's position in the crisis may be irreparable. The damage to President Carter's political fortunes may be eventually fatal.

First of all, the resignation of Cyrus Vance puts into doubt the continuity and stability of the policy-making groups within the administration. The Vance resignation leaves our foreign policy in the hands of academics who are still relative novices in the field of career diplomacy. To compound the problem, the President has not had any of the previous experience in foreign policy upon which his two Presidential predecessors drew. Vance had served capably in four consecutive administrations. He was well respected by our European allies. He helped conduct the Vietnam negotiations, the Cyrus talks, trade negotiations with Common Market nations, and he played a crucial role in both Egyptian-Israeli agreements and in the SALT II treaty. Cyrus Vance was referred to by Helmut Schmidt and England's Lord Carrington as America's most competent diplomat. His departure complicates an already testy situation with our allies in Europe.

It is too easy for us to condemn our allies for their reluctance to join our self-righteous indignation. "Well," we glibly exclaim, "We have done so much for them, and now they turn their back on us!" This is quite simply not the case.

Our allies would be glad to assist us in these troubled times. They recognize our importance to their own security. And yet, they are understandably reluctant to immediately answer our every urgent plea. Our policy has not been a model of consistency. The Europeans have seen us indignantly proclaim that, in the case of Russian troops in Cuba, "the status quo is not acceptable." Two weeks later our President suddenly reversed himself and decided that the situation was acceptable after all.

Last week, the President urged our European allies to support us in peaceful economic sanctions against Iran. He did so while pledging that America would not resort to

military action "in the foreseeable future." The Europeans agreed to the sanctions and within forty-eight hours Americans were on the ground in Iran to set up a military base for the armed rescue of our hostages. Whether or not the rescue was the right thing to do is not relevant to the fact that the allies now feel betrayed by another example of a foreign policy about-face by the Carter Administration.

The public show of unity among the Common Market nations thinly masks their deep and abiding doubts about the nature and conduct of America's foreign policy. Vance's departure can only increase these doubts.

There are also continuing doubts about the Carter foreign policy here in America. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has publicly criticized the nation's current leadership only once, but his criticism was wide-ranging. It will be interesting to see how deeply his disagreements are exposed this Sunday evening when 60 Minutes talks to Dr. Kissinger about his relationship with the former shah of Iran.

The momentary support lent to Carter following the failure of the Iran rescue mission is already beginning to disintegrate amidst the belief of many Americans that the major fault of the mission was in its planning and lack of adequate back-up equipment. "Damn," complained one soldier at Fort Bragg, "We should have sub-contracted with the Israelis." Time and Newsweek have already hit the streets with cover stories proclaiming the mission a "disaster" and a "fiasco". With the alleged dispersal of the hostages throughout the nation, many thoughtful Americans have come to the uneasy conclusion that at least some of the hostages will never live to see America again.

The current situation can only hurt President Carter's chances for the Democratic nomination. When the shock of the moment subsides, the President will be faced with a growing suspicion that he should not remain President. Unless the Iranian crisis drastically changes for the better then President Carter may have to suffer serious consequences. He may even lose his job. This is as it should be.

For Air Conditioning

It Will Have To

Be A Hot Day

According to the Office Manager of the Physical Plant, Harry Sangren, it depends on Mother Nature as to whether or not the air-conditioning will be activated before the end of Spring term. "The main idea is conserving energy," Mr. Sangren told me. "It will not be turned on unless absolutely necessary."

It was a plumbing problem, not the air-conditioning, that was causing some noise disturbance in several dorms recently. "The problem," said Mr. Sangren, "has now been corrected."

Lame Duck Senate

by RHONDA BOYD

The end is drawing near for the 1979-1980 Inter-Dormitory Senate. As soon as all of the

elections have been completed, the old senate will step down and allow the new senate to begin its reign. In the mean time, we are trying to tie up all of the old business. Some of this in-

Holds Meeting For Next Year

cludes placement of resolutions, formation of a bill, and investigation of infirmity conditions.

The Senate is looking into the possibility of beginning a new tradition at St. Andrews. Senators Mosely (Albemarle)

and Woodson (Orange) have begun checking into the possibility of having a cocktail party for the seniors and faculty.

At the last meeting, held April 28, the Senators were requested to return the Task

Force Forms. It is important that everyone fill these out and return them. The next senate meeting will be held May 5 in the Belk Center Main Lounge. The meetings are open to anyone interested.

Greg Piccola Editor
Andrew Montgomery..... Layout
Michael Snider..... Photography
Rooney Coffman.....
Charles Booker Sports
Steven Cole Cartoonist
Staff:

Dan Philips Blake
Martin Brossman

Richard Grassi
Billy Hamby

THE
LANCE
STAFF

Rhonda Boyd
Greyton Flanagan
Anne Franklin

Elizabeth McAnulty
Michael Saleeby
Daniel Sotler

Printed by The Laurinburg Exchange

The opinions expressed in THE LANCE are not necessarily those of St. Andrews Presbyterian College.
(Copyright 1980 Gregory R. Piccola)